

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. VII, 3.

WHOLE NO. 27.

---

## I.—THE NEW REVISION OF KING JAMES' REVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

### V.

#### EXAMINATION OF THE REVISION OF S. MATTHEW (*continued*).

CH. XIX. v. 1. *it came to pass—he departed*, closely after the Greek; so Wycl., Tynd., and Rh.; and so Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; it came to pass, *that*, etc., A. V., and so Dr. Noyes; see on 7, 28. *borders*, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; *coasts*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; so Mr. Darby. *beyond Jordan*, omitting the Gr. article, after Wycl. and all the rest; and so Sir John Cheke and Dean Alford; the Jordan, Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; see on 3, 5.—v. 3. *And there came unto him Pharisees*, to preserve the Gr. order, after Tynd., Gen., and Rh.; so Dean Alford; The Pharisees also came unto him, A. V. after Wycl. and Cranmer; and so Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; *Pharisees*, by change of text omitting the article, after Lachmann and Tregelles; so Wycl.; the Pharisees, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *And there came* etc., closer to the Greek, after Sir John Cheke, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; The P. also came, A. V. after Cran. *saying*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Wycl. and Rh., after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); saying unto him, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *for a man*, supplied and italicized; for a man, A. V., supplied but not italicized.—v. 4. *said*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); said unto them, A. V. after Wycl. and all the

rest. *he which*, after A. V. and the rest; Wycl., *he that*; see on 2, 6. *from the beginning*, closer to the Gr. ( $\alpha\pi' \alpha\rho\chi\eta\varsigma$ ), after Rh.; at the beginning, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *his father and mother*, rendering the Gr. article by a possessive, after Sir John Cheke, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; father and mother, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Mr. Darby; see on 1, 24. *the twain*, close to the Gr. after Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby (*the two*); they twain, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; and so Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson. *shall become*, to keep closer to the Gr. ( $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  eis—), after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; so nearly 2d Gen., shall be made; shall be, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. — v. 6. *So that*, close to the Gr. ( $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ ), after Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson, and Wycl. nearly, And so; Wherefore, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 7. *Why then did Moses*, to preserve the Gr. order, after Wycl. and Rh.; Why did Moses then, A. V. after Cran. *a bill of divorcement*, by a more technical rendering, after Sir John Cheke and Rh.; a writing of etc., A. V. by a new rendering. — v. 8. *For your hardness of heart*, after Wycl. and Rh. nearly, for the hardness of your heart; because of the hardness of your hearts, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *it hath not been so*, to preserve the Gr. perfect, after Sir John Cheke; and so Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson; it was not so, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Mr. Darby; see on 2, 2.—v. 9. *except for*, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; except *it be* for, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *he that*, closer to the Greek, after Rh.; *whoso*, A. V. after Cran. *when she is put away*, by a new rendering, but nearly after Dean Alford, her put away; her which is put away, A. V. by a new rendering. *commilleth*, after Rh.; doth commit, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 10. *The disciples*, by an omission from the text after Tischendorf; *His disciples*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). *If—is*, to preserve the Gr. indicative, after Wycl.; *If—be*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see on 4, 3. *expedient*, closer to the Greek, after Rh.; good, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 11. *but they*, after Rh.; save they, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 12. *eunuchs*, close to the Greek; after Wycl., Tynd., and Rh.; some eunuchs, A. V. after Cran. and Gen. *eunuchs which*: so A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so Dean Alford; eunuchs who, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; and so twice again in this verse;

see on 2, 6. *by men*, after Rh.; of men, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *made*, to preserve the Gr. aorist, after Sir John Cheke, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; have made, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; and so Dr. Campbell and Mr. Darby; see on 2, 2. — v. 13. *his hands*, rendering the article as a possessive, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; *his hands*, A. V.; see on 1, 24. — v. 14. *the little children*, preserving the article, after Wycl. and all the rest; little children, A. V. by a new rendering. — v. 16. *one came to him and said*, by a change of order in the Greek, after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; one came and said unto him, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). *Master*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; Good Master, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). — v. 17. *Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good*, by a change of text, after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; so nearly Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*), One is good, God; Why callest thou me good? *there is* none good but one, *that is*, God, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; and so the text in the parallel passage, S. Mark 10, 18. *wouldest enter*, a free but idiomatic rendering of the Greek (*θέλεις*—), after Dr. Campbell and Mr. Darby; wilt enter, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so Dr. Noyes and Dean Alford; and so in v. 21. — v. 18. *And Jesus said*, preserving the introductory particle (*ὅτι*), after Wycl., Tynd., Gen., and Rh.; Jesus said, A. V. omitting the particle, after Cran. *Thou shalt not kill*, after Tynd., Sir John Cheke, and Gen., and to conform to S. Mark 10, 19, where A. V. has *to kill*; but the Rev. regularly render the verbal noun (*φόνος*) which belongs to this verb (*φονεύειν*) by *murder*; as S. Mk. 15, 7; S. Lk. 23, 19, 25; Rom. 1, 29; Thou shalt do no murder, A. V. nearly after Rh. — v. 19. *thy father and thy mother*, by change of reading after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, and by rendering the article as a possessive, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Mr. Darby; and so Wycl. and Rh.; thy father and *thy* mother, A. V. — v. 20. *have I observed*, after Tynd., and so Dr. Campbell, and by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); have I kept from my youth up, A. V. after Cran.; on the aorist here rendered by the perfect, see on 2, 2. — v. 21. *go, sell*, close to the Greek, after Gen. and Rh.; *go and sell*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *that thou hast*: so A. V. after Tynd.

and Gen.; what thou hast, Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby; see on 13, 12. *come, follow me*, close to the Greek, after Rh.; come and follow me, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 22. *the saying*, close to the Greek; that saying, A. V., rendering the article by the demonstrative, after Wycl. and the rest; see on 6, 23. *he was one that had great possessions*, by a new and very free rendering; for he had great possessions, A. V. very closely after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; for he had many possessions, Wycl. and Rh. still closer. — v. 23. *And Jesus said*, rendering the Gr. particle ( $\delta\epsilon$ ) closely, and preserving the Greek order, after Wycl. and Rh.; Then said Jesus, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen., except the matter of order. *It is hard for a rich man to enter*, very freely after Tynd.; That a rich man shall hardly enter, A. V. closely, after 2d Gen. and Rh.; on *That* here ( $\delta\tau\iota$ ), see on 2, 23. — v. 24. *a needle's eye*, after Wycl. and Sir John Cheke; the eye of a needle, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 25. *And when*, preserving the introductory particle ( $\delta\epsilon$ ), after Gen. and Rh.; When, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., and Cran. *the disciples*, by a change of reading after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); his disciples, A. V. *were astonished exceedingly*, after Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson nearly, were exceedingly astonished; were exceedingly amazed, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 26. *And Jesus*, rendering the particle ( $\delta\epsilon$ ) as continuative, after Rh. and 2d Gen.; But Jesus, A. V., as adversative, after Cran.; so de Wette, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; *looking upon them said*, after Mr. Darby nearly, looking at [them] said; beheld them and said, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; *to them*, after Wycl. and Rh.; unto them, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 27. *Lo*, after Wycl.; Behold, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *have left*, after Rh.; have forsaken, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; and so in v. 29. *what then* ( $\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ ) *shall we have?* preserving the Greek order, and nearly after Wycl., what thanne schal be to us? what shall we have therefore, A. V. after Cran. — v. 28. *ye which*, after A. V.; and so Tynd., Gen., and Rh.; ye that, Wycl. and Cran.; see on 2, 6. *on the throne*, closer to the Greek ( $\epsilon\pi\iota$  with gen.), after Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes; upon etc., Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson. — v. 29. *or mother*, with an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; or mother, or wife, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). *a hundredfold*, after Dr. Campbell and Mr. Darby; an hundredfold, A. V. after



Wycl. and all the rest ; see on 5, 14. *eternal life*, after Dr. Campbell and Dean Alford ; life eternal, preserving the Greek order, Mr. Darby ; everlasting life, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen. ; and, life everlasting, in the Greek order, Rh. ; see on 25, 46. — v. 30. *many shall be last that are first ; and first that are last*, by a new rendering and order ; many *that are* first shall be last ; and the last *shall be* first, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.

CH. XX. v. 1. *that is*, supplied after Cran., Rh., and A. V., but not italicized ; *that is*, A. V. ; so Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson ; better, *that was*, as in 21, 33, the matter narrated belonging to the past ; see on 1, 17. *a householder*, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Mr. Darby ; an householder, A. V. ; see on 5, 14. *householder which* : so A. V. after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh. ; husbonde man that, Wycl. ; see on 2, 6. — v. 3. *standing in the marketplace idle*, to conform to the order of the Greek, after Rh. ; standing idle in the marketplace, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 4. *to them he said*, to conform to the order of the Greek, after Mr. Darby ; said unto them, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 5. *about the sixth and the ninth hour*, supplying the second article (the Greek here omits both), after Wycl. and Rh. ; the sixth and ninth hour, A. V. omitting the second article after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. ; and so Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson ; which is good English usage ; see on 8, 11. — v. 6. *standing*, with an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles ; so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*) ; standing idle, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest ; and it would be better to supply *idle* here and italicize it ; see on v. 32. — v. 7. *Go ye also into the vineyard*, with an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles ; so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*) ; Go ye also into the vineyard ; and whatsoever is right, *that* shall ye receive, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 8. *And*, to keep close to the Greek (*δέ*), after Wycl., Gen., and Rh. ; So, A. V. freely after Cran. *pay*, to keep closer to the Greek (*ἀπόδος*), after Rh. ; give, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 10. *And when*, by a change of text, after Tregelles ; and so Mr. Darby ; But when, A. V. after Wycl., Cran., and Rh. ; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). *they supposed that they would receive more*, substantially after Wycl., Tynd., Gen., and Rh. ; they supposed that they should have received more, A. V. after Cran., and so Sir John Cheke. There is good authority then for both these usages in this passage. The

general usage is this: after verbs of thinking, supposing; of hoping, fearing; of intending, designing, and words expressing kindred ideas, a verb of the same tense or of the future is logically required. But for the sake of marking the matter as over and done with the past tense is also sometimes used, and that by excellent writers of all periods. The Revisers of the O. T. have therefore properly retained this latter usage in some instances; as, 1 Sam. 1, 13, Eli thought she had been drunken; 2 Sam. 21, 16, he—thought to have slain David; but the Revisers of the N. T. have removed it in every instance, so far as we have observed; as S. Mark 6, 49, they supposed it had been a spirit; Rev., —that it was an apparition; so S. Luke 24, 37; Acts 14, 19; S. John 11, 13, they thought that he had spoken etc.; Rev., —that he spake; Acts 7, 25, he supposed his brethren would have understood; Rev., —that his brethren understood; S. Luke 2, 44, supposing him to have been; Rev., —him to be; ib. 23, 8, he hoped to have seen; Rev., —to see; ib. 24, 21, we trusted it had been he; Rev., —hoped that it was he; Acts 5, 26, they feared the people, lest they should have been stoned; Rev., —lest they should be stoned; ib. 22, 30, because he would have known; Rev., —desiring to know; S. Luke 24, 28, he made as though he would have gone; Rev., —would go; Heb. 11, 15, they might have had opportunity to have returned; Rev., —opportunity to return.

We subjoin the following examples in vindication of the usage rejected by the Revisers. From Sir John Maundeville: thei trowed that oure Lord Jesu Christ scholde have honged on the Cros etc., p. 10; p. 123; thei wolde, that it scholde have lasted longe, p. 10; so was this cursed Kyng never made Sorwe for, as he supposed for to have been, p. 89. From Ellis' Original Letters, Third Series, Vol. I: the Kyngs Highnes and other men shold a ben the bettar enchoraged to [have] attempted like thyngs herafter, p. 267; he said—it shulde have been very harde to have broughte theym to have consented in hym, p. 310. From Spenser: I was about to have told you my reason, Present State of Ireland, p. 613, *a*; I ment to have deducted out of etc., p. 668, *b*; in hope to have cutt of (off) her Majestie, p. 620, *b*; Neither indeed would I have thought that any such antiquities could have been avouched etc., p. 629, *a*; p. 672, *b*. From Shakspeare: Then thought they to have done Some wanton charm etc., Temp. iv. 96; ib. 168; I did think to have beaten thee, Much Ado v. 4, 111; I have good hope thou didst not know on't, K. Lear ii.

4, 191; you durst not so have tempted him, J. Cæsar iv. 3. From Hooker: it was in the chiefest of David's desires to have performed so good a work, v. 11; to have settled Constantius the same way had been a duty, v. 42; if they had been themselves able to have made their own (professions), v. 64. From the Translator's Dedication of A. V.: it was the expectation of many—that—clouds of darkness would so have overshadowed this land, that men should have been in doubt etc., p. 119; We hoped that we had been in the right way, Pref. of A. V., p. 111, *b*. From Dryden: Neither durst I have justified your Lordship in it, Prol. to Dram. Poesy, p. 5; I was going to have named the Fox, Dram. Poesy, p. 90; I had thought to have written etc., Pref. to Mock Astrologer, p. 189; there had been many in a readiness to have followed etc., Ded. of Dram. Poesy, p. 27. From Addison: we hoped to have seen the great men—that we might have discovered etc., Spect. No. 50; I did not design to have troubled him, No. 72; I would fain have fallen asleep again to have closed my vision, No. 3; What would I not have given to have stopt it? No. 57. From Dr. Johnson: He intended to have taken orders, Lives, pp. 454, 520; Garrick, whom I hoped to have gratified etc., p. 525; other cases are found on pp. 144, 181, 322, 468, 518, 525, and Adv., p. i. From Burke: A Letter intended to have been sent to a Gentleman in Paris, on the title p. of Reflections on the Revolution in France; I should have thought that a Ministerial promise might have been given, Thoughts etc., p. 72. I have given him, I hope, a satisfactory answer, American Tax, p. 116. Sometimes we find both usages combined: for to make him lepe down, and have slain him, Sir John Maundeville, p. 113; the peculiar character of the house would have led him to call—for every public account, and to have examined into them, Burke, Thoughts etc., p. 69.—v. 11. *received*, to preserve the Gr. aorist (λαβόντες), after Wycl. (*token*); and so Dr. Davidson; *had received*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and so Sir John Cheke, Dr. Noyes, and Dean Alford; see on 1, 24. *the householder*, to conform to v. 1; good-man of the house, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh.—v. 12. *have spent but one hour*, after Dr. Davidson nearly, made one hour; and so Meyer, *Com. ad h. l.*; have wrought *but* one hour, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; so the Vulg., *unâ horâ fecerunt*; and so Sir John Cheke, Dr. Campbell, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, de Wette, and Germ. and Holl. Rev.; and Dr. Edersheim, Life of Christ II, p. 419, prefers this reading,

maintaining against Meyer that it is more suitable to the context and that ποιῶν here represents the Hebrew *הַיֹּמָה*, as it commonly does in the LXX. *us which* : and so A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. ; *us that*, Wycl. and Rh. ; see on 2, 6. *the burden of the day and the scorching heat*, to conform to the order of the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh. ; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*) ; in the same order, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson ; the burden and heat of the day, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. ; and so Sir John Cheke, Dr. Campbell, and Dr. Noyes ; and this is the natural order in English. The Revisers themselves, after A. V., render in the text Acts 2, 42, τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, *in the apostles' teaching* (doctrine, A. V.) *and fellowship*, which is a case of the same Greek order, that is, when a genitive limits two or more nouns, it is sometimes placed after the first limited word as well in Hellenistic as in classical Greek ; as, in N. T. : οἱ ταῦτοί μου καὶ τὰ σιτιστά, S. Matt. 22, 4 ; so 18, 25 ; 20, 23 ; S. Mark 5, 40 ; αἱ βάσεις αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ σφύδρα, Acts 3, 7 ; τὸν πατέρα τῆς παιδὸς καὶ τὴν μητέρα, S. Luke 8, 51 ; 14, 26 ; 18, 20 ; τὰ τετράποδα τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ τὰ ἑρπετά, Acts 11, 6 ; 10, 24 ; in classic Greek : ἵχνη ἵππων καὶ κόπρος, Xen. Anab. i. 6, 1 ; φυγαὶ τοσαῖδε ἀνθρώπων καὶ φόνος, Thuc. i. 23 ; τὴν ἀγνωμοσύνην αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βασκανίαν ; Dem. de Cor. §252 ; περὶ εὐεξίαν τε τῶν σωμάτων καὶ καχεξίαν, Plat. Gorg., p. 450, a. And this order is imitated in Latin : domini omnium rerum ac moderatores, Cic. de Legibus ii. 7 ; societas hominum conjunctioque, id. de Off. i. 5 ; and so i. 20 ; i. 21 ; aetatem eorum et—indolem, Liv. i. 5 ; habitum oris lineamentaue, id. xxi. 4. — v. 13. *he answered and said to one of them*, to preserve the order of the Greek, after Rh. ; he answered one of them and said, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen. ; so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). *didst not thou* : and so A. V., but the pronoun is not expressed in the Greek, and therefore *didst thou not*, with Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh., is better ; and so Sir John Cheke, Dr. Campbell, and Mr. Darby. — v. 14. *Take up*, by a new rendering, to keep closer to the Greek (ἄρον) ; Take, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. *that which*, after Tynd. and Gen. ; that, A. V. after Cran. and Rh. ; see on 13, 12. *it is my will* (θέλω) *to give*, to avoid ambiguity, after Dr. Campbell and Mr. Darby ; so, I desire to give, Dr. Davidson ; I will (not here an auxiliary) give, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest ; see on 11, 14 and 27. — v. 15. *or is*, after Dean Alford, and by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles ; Is, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh. — v. 16. *So the last*



*shall be first, and the first last*, by an omission from the text after Tischendorf of words put in brackets by Tregelles and Dean Alford ; So the last shall be first, and the first last : for many be called but few chosen, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest ; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). — v. 17. *as Jesus was going up*, by a free rendering after Dr. Noyes, and nearly after Sir John Cheke, as Jesus was coming up ; Jesus going up, A. V. close to the Greek, after Cran. and Rh. *apart, and in the way he said*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles ; apart in the way, and said, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *in the way* : and so A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. ; and so Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson ; better, on the way, Dr. Noyes ; see on 5, 25. — v. 18. *shall be delivered*, to conform to the next verse, after Rh. ; and so Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson ; shall be betrayed, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *unto the chief priests and scribes*, keeping close to the Greek, after Wycl. and Sir John Cheke ; unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. ; see on 8, 11. — v. 19. *unto*, by a new rendering, to conform to v. 18 ; to, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *to crucify*, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson ; to crucify *him*, A. V. after Sir John Cheke and 2d Gen. *shall be raised up*, by a change of text after Tischendorf and Tregelles ; shall rise again, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. — v. 20. *the sons of Zebedee*, closer to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh. ; Zebedee's children, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *asking*, closer to the Greek (*αἰροῦσα*), after Wycl. ; desiring, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 21. *wouldest*, by a free and idiomatic rendering, after 2d Gen. ; wilt, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest ; see on 19, 18. *Command*, closer to the Greek (*Εἰπέ*), after Sir John Cheke and Dean Alford ; Grant, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *one—one*, to keep close to the Greek after Wycl. and Rh. ; the one—the other, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *thy left hand*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, after Wycl. and Rh., *hand* being repeated for the sake of dignity ; the left, A. V. after Cran. ; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). — v. 22. *that I am about to drink*, closer to the Greek, after Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson ; that I shall drink of, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh. ; with an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles ; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*) ; and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with ? added in A. V. after Tynd., Cran.,

and Gen.; and so in the next verse. — v. 23. *He saith*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); And he saith, A. V. after Tynd. and Gen. *My cup indeed ye shall drink*, by change of order after the Greek, and so Rh.; Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, A. V. after Cran. and Gen. *on my left hand*, supplying *hand* for the sake of dignity, after Tynd. and Gen.; on my left, A. V. after Cran. and Rh. *it is for them*, supplied in new form; *it shall be given to them*, supplied by A. V. after Gen. *hath been prepared*, to preserve the Greek perfect, after Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson; is prepared, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh.; see on 2, 2. — v. 24. *concerning*, to keep close to the Greek (*περί*); so nearly Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson, about; against, A. V. by a new rendering. — v. 25. *unto him*, supplied but not italicized as implied in the verb; *unto him*, A. V. *the rulers*, after Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; the princes, A. V. after Wycl., Cran., and Rh. *lord it over*, after Dr. Noyes; so Wycl. nearly, *ben lordis of*; exercise dominion over, A. V. after Cran. nearly, *have dominion over*; exercise lordship over, Mr. Darby, and this is more dignified than the form of the Revisers. *their great ones*, by a new rendering; they that are great, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., and Gen. *over them*, after Tynd. and Gen.; upon them, A. V. after Wycl. (*on hem*) and Cran. — v. 26. *Not so shall it be*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, and by a change of order to conform to the Greek, after Dr. Noyes; But it shall not be so, A. V. after 2d Gen. *would become* (*γενέσθαι*), after Dr. Campbell; will become, Dean Alford; desireth to become, Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson; will be, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; see on 15, 28. *shall be*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; let him be, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). — v. 27. *would be*, closer to the Greek (*— ἂν θέλη εἶναι*), after Dr. Campbell and Mr. Darby; will be, A. V. after Wycl. and all. *shall be*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); let him be, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 29. *went out*, after Rh.; departed, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; this is the substitution of an English for a Romance word; see on 4, 12. — v. 30. *was passing by* (a progressive imperfect by attraction), after Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby; passed by, A. V. after Cran. and Rh.; and so Dean Alford. *Lord, have mercy on us*, by a change of text after Lachmann and

Tregelles; and so Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); Have mercy on us, O Lord, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; and so again in the next verse. — v. 31. *that they should hold their peace* (ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν), after Rh., and Wycl. nearly, that thei schulden be stille; because they should hold their peace, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; *because* was anciently used to denote *purpose* as well as *cause*; so the Greek ὡς denotes *cause* and *purpose*, and also *result* under the form ὥστε; the Latin *ut*, *cause*, and also *purpose* or *result*; and the English *as*, *cause* and under the form *so as* often, as in Spenser, *result*, and sometimes in Shaksp. under the simple form *as*, Tam. of Shrew, Ind. i. 70; Winter's Tale, v. 3, 68. This use of *because* is rare, but it is found also in Acts 20, 16, because he would not spend etc. (ὥπως with subjunct.); that he might not have to spend etc., Rev.; and in Spenser's State of Ireland, because they shall not take etc. = that they may not take etc., p. 669, Globe ed. *cried out*, after Rh.; *cried*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 32. *stood still*, supplying but not italicizing *still*; so A. V. stood still. The word is well supplied. Verbs of *standing*, *sitting* (and kindred words, as *to abide*, *remain*) and of *lying*, are sometimes used absolutely in Greek and Latin, where our idiom requires a modifying word. This modification has commonly been supplied and italicized by A. V. and the Rev.; as, Acts 15, 33; 16, 15; 18, 11; but sometimes supplied by both and not italicized; as, 26, 73; S. Mark 10, 49; S. Luke 7, 14; it is supplied by A. V. and italicized, and supplied by the Rev. and not italicized in Acts 22, 12; in S. John 19, 29 it was not supplied by A. V., but was supplied but not italicized by the Rev.; in Acts 14, 3 it was not supplied by A. V., but was supplied and italicized by the Rev.; it was neglected by both in S. Luke 18, 40, Jesus stood (σθαθεῖς); better, —stood *still*, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and in S. John 20, 5 and 6, he seeth the linen cloths lying (κείμενα); better, —lying *there*, after de Wette. So above v. 6, standing (ἵστῶρας, by an omission from the text) Rev.; better, standing *idle*. Compare in classical Greek: στήναι, to stand *still*, Aristoph. Av. 1308; κείμενον, lying *dead*, Thuc. vii. 75; and in Latin: stare, to stand *by*, Juv. 7, 11; sedere, to sit *still*, Cic. pro Sest. 15; and Hor. Ep. i. 17, 37; jacere, to lie *sick*, Cic. ad Fam. ix. 20; to lie *dead*, Virg. Aen. i. 99. *should do*, correctly, after Tynd. and Gen.; shall do, A. V., incorrectly, after Cran.; do, also correctly, Wycl. and Rh. — v. 34. *And*, rendering the Greek particle (δέ continuative) strictly, after Wycl., Gen., and Rh.; So, A. V. freely, after Cran. *being moved*

*with compassion*, closer to the Greek after 2d Gen., moved with compassion; had compassion *on them*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. *straightway*, by a new rendering; immediately, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; this is the substitution of an English for a Romance word; see on 4, 12. *they received*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); their eyes received, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest.

CH. XXI. v. 1. *came*, to preserve the Greek aorist, after Wycl.; were come, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see on 2, 2. *unto Bethphage*, by a new rendering; to B., A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. — v. 2. *then Jesus sent*, to conform to the order of the Greek, after Sir John Cheke and Rh.; then sent Jesus, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; the Revisers are not consistent in this matter: then saith he (τότε λέγει) 9, 6; Then touched he (τότε ἥψατο) 9, 29; but, Then he arose (τότε ἐγερθεῖς) 8, 26; comp. also 4, 5, 11. — v. 2. *village that is over against*, to preserve the force of the second article in the Greek, after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh.; village over against, A. V. after Sir John Cheke. — v. 3. *any one*, closer to the Greek (τις), after Dr. Noyes; Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; any *man*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. *ought*, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Dr. Davidson; ought, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see on 5, 23. — v. 4. *Now*, preserving the Greek particle (δέ), after Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes; And, Rh.; All this, A. V. omitting the particle, after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *this*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). All this, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *is come to pass that it might be fulfilled*, by a new rendering; was done that etc., A. V. after Cran., 2d Gen., and Rh.; was doon, that that thing schulde be fulfillid, Wycl.; so Sir John Cheke, Dr. Noyes, and Mr. Darby; hath come to pass, that it may be fulfilled, Dean Alford; is come to pass, that it may be fulfilled, Dr. Davidson. *it—which*: and so A. V. after Cran., 2d Gen., and Rh.; that thing—that, Wycl.; that which, Tynd.; see on 1, 22. — v. 5. *riding upon*, by a free rendering, after Sir John Cheke, Dr. Campbell, and Dr. Noyes; mounted upon, Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson; sitting upon, A. V. after Wycl. and all. *and upon*, by a change of the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; *and*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). — v. 6. *even as*, by a new and fuller rendering of the Greek (καθώς not ὥς); as, A. V.



after Wycl. and the rest. *appointed*, by a new rendering, closer to the Greek (*συνέταξε*); commanded, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 7. *garments*, to conform to v. 8; and so Rh.; clothes, A. V. after Cran. and Gen. *he sat*, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson, after Stephens' text (*ἠπεκάθισεν*); they set *him*, A. V. after Wycl. and all, according to Beza's text (*ἐπεκάθισαν*); and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). — v. 8. *the most part of the multitude*, by a new and closer rendering; most of the multitude, Dr. Davidson; very many of the multitude, Dr. Noyes; the greater part, Dr. Campbell; many of the people, Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen.; a very great multitude, A. V. after Rh. *and others*, preserving the Greek particle (*καί*), after Gen. and Rh.; others, omitting the particle, A. V. after Wycl. and Cran. — v. 9. *before him*, by an addition to the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; before, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). — v. 10. *was stirred*, after Wycl.; on a stirre, Sir John Cheke; was moved, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 11. *the multitudes*, close to the Greek, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; the multitude, A. V. by a new rendering; the puple, Wycl. and the rest. *This is the prophet, Jesus*, by a change of order in the Greek, after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; This is Jesus the prophet, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). *from Nazareth*, after Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson; *who cometh from N.*, Sir John Cheke; of Nazareth, A. V. after Wycl. and all. — v. 12. *entered into*, after Wycl. and Rh.; went into, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; this is the substitution of a Romance for an English phrase; see on 1, 24. *the doves*, preserving the Greek article, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; doves, omitting the article, A. V. after Wycl. and all. — v. 13. *saith*, close to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; said, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *a house*, omitting the definite article after the Greek; and so Wycl., Sir John Cheke, Dr. Campbell, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; the house, supplying the definite article, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; and so Dean Alford. *make*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; have made, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). *robbers*, more correctly, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; thieves, A. V. after Wycl. and all. — v. 15. *But* (*καί* adversative), after Wycl. and 2d Gen.; And (continuative), A. V. after 1st Gen. and Rh. *the scribes*, retaining the second Greek article, after Sir John Cheke, Dr. Camp-

bell, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; scribes, omitting the article, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; and so Dean Alford; and it may well be omitted; see on 8, 11. *children that were crying*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; children crying, A. V. after Wycl. and all. *were moved with indignation*, by a new rendering; hadden indignacioun, Wycl.; and so Rh.; were sore displeased, A. V. by a new rendering; so Dean Alford. — v. 16. *are saying*, by a new rendering in the progressive form; say, A. V. after Wycl. and all. *did ye never read*, to preserve the Greek aorist, after Sir John Cheke, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; read ye never, Gen.; have ye never read, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; see on 2, 2. *thou hast perfected*, a perfect for the Greek aorist; and so A. V. after Wycl. and all; see as before. — v. 17. *went forth*, to give the verb fully, after Wycl. and Rh.; *went*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *to (eis) Bethany*, as more appropriate here, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Mr. Darby; unto B., Tynd., Cran., 2d Gen.; and so Dean Alford; into B., A. V. after Wycl. and Rh.; and so Dr. Davidson; and so in the next verse. — v. 19. *seeing*, closer to the Greek, after Sir John Cheke, Rh. and 2d Gen.; when he saw, A. V. by a new rendering. *by the way side*, excellently, after Rh.; bisidis the weie, Wycl.; in the way, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; see on 5, 25. *saith*, close to the Greek, after Rh.; said, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *Let there be no fruit from thee*, closer to the Greek, after Dr. Noyes; and perhaps closer still, Never fruyt come forth (*γένηται*) of thee, Wycl.; or, Never grow there fruite of thee, Rh.; see on 15, 28. *immediately*, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; presently, A. V. by a new rendering, but now antiquated. — v. 20. *How did the fig tree immediately wither away?* by a new rendering, making the introductory particle (*πῶς*) interrogative; so probably the Vulg., *Quomodo continuo aruit?* *How is it withered incontinent?* Rh.; so de Wette, Germ. Rev., Holl. Rev. and Weitzsäcker; How (exclamatory) soon is the fig tree withered away! A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and so substantially Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson, taking *πῶς* as exclamatory, as in S. Mark 10, 23, 24; and *Quomodo* may be so taken with the verb in the rendering of the Vulg.; comp. Cic. Att. 8, 16; Lact. 2, 9. — v. 21. *And Jesus*, preserving the Greek particle (*καί*), after Wycl. and Rh.; Jesus, omitting the particle, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *what*, after Dr. Noyes and Mr.

Darby; this which, A. V. by a new rendering; this that, Cran.; that which, Tynd. and Gen. *even* (*kai* emphatic), after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; also, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *Be thou taken up*, closer to the Greek, after Dr. Noyes; Take up—thyself, Rh.; Be thou removed, A. V. by a new rendering; Remove, Cran. *and cast*, for the unification of the sentence, after Dr. Noyes; see on 5, 11. — v. 24. *one question*, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; a question, Dr. Campbell; a certayne question, Tynd. and 1st Gen.; one thing, A. V. by a new rendering. *likewise*, after 2d Gen.; in like wise, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. — v. 25. *from—or from*, close to the Greek (*ἐξ—ἐξ*), after Rh.; from—or of, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and so again in the next verse. *Why then did ye not*, to preserve the order of the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; Why did ye not then, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 26. *the multitude*, after Rh.; the people, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 27. *We know not*, close to the Greek, after Wycl. (*We witen not*) and Rh.; We cannot tell, to correspond in form with what follows, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *He also*, close to the Greek, after Rh.; And he, incorrectly, A. V. after Wycl., Cran., and Gen. — v. 28. *A man*, after Wycl. and Cran.; *A certain man*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *the vineyard*, by an omission from the text, after Tischendorf and Tregelles; my vineyard, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). — v. 29. *And he*, preserving the Greek particle (*δε*), after Wycl. and Rh.; He, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. *repented himself* (reflexive pronoun), after 2d Gen.; repented him, Sir John Cheke; repented, A. V. after Tynd. and Cran. — v. 30. *and went not*: so A. V. after Wycl., Cran., and Rh.; it is better to take the particle here (*kai*) as adversative, yet went not, after Tynd. and Gen.; so, but went not, Dr. Campbell; see on 1, 25. — v. 31. *Whether* (*τις*): so A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; Who, Wycl.; Which, Rh.; see on 9, 5 and 23, 17. *of the twain*, after Wycl.; of them twain, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *his father*, not italicizing *his*, the article being here used as a possessive pronoun; see on 1, 24; *his father*, A. V. *They say*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); They say unto him, A. V. after Wycl. and all. — v. 32. *saw*, to preserve the Greek aorist, after Wycl., Tynd., and Gen.; had seen, A. V. after Cran.; see on 1, 24. *did—repent yourselves*, to conform to v. 29, after Sir John Cheke; repented, A. V.

by a new rendering; *not even*, by a change of text after Lachmann and Tregelles; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); not, A. V. after Wycl. and all; on *not even* see on 27, 14. — v. 33. *a man that was a householder*, by a new rendering; a certain householder, A. V. after Tynd. and Gen.; *a householder*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; a certain householder, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *householder, which*: and so A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; h. that, Wycl.; h. who, Rh.; see on 2, 6. *set a hedge about it*, after Sir John Cheke; so Dr. Noyes and Dean Alford; hedged it round about, A. V. after Tynd., Cran.; and Gen.; heggide it aboute, Wycl. *went into another country*, by a new and closer rendering; *went into a far country*, A. V. by a new rendering. — v. 34. *the season* (*καιρός*), conforming to v. 41, after Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson; the time, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *the fruits*, to preserve the Greek plural, after Wycl. and Rh.; the fruit, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *to receive*, close to the Greek form, after Tynd., Gen., and Rh.; that they might receive, A. V. after Cran. — v. 36. *in like manner*, after Wycl.; and so Dean Alford and Mr. Darby; and so the Rev. render the Greek adverb here (*ὁσαύτως*) in 25, 17; but they render it *likewise* in 20, 5; 21, 30; likewise, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 37. *afterward*, close to the Greek, after Sir John Cheke; so Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson; last of all, A. V. freely, after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 38. *the husbandmen, when they saw the son, said*, nearer the Greek form, after Dr. Noyes; when the husbandmen saw the son, they said, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *take*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; but so Tynd. and Gen.; seize on, A. V., by a new rendering. — v. 39. *took*, close to the Greek, after Wycl., Sir John Cheke, and 2d Gen.; caught, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. *forth out of*, to give the Greek fully, after Rh.; out of, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *killed*, after Rh.; slew, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 40. *When therefore the lord*, closer to the order of the Greek, after Gen. and Rh.; When the lord therefore, A. V. after Cran. *shall come*, close to the Greek, after Wycl., Gen., and Rh.; cometh, A. V. after Tynd. and Cran. — v. 41. *miserable men*, to preserve the paronomasia (*miserably—miserable*), after Dr. Davidson; so, but in different ways, it is preserved by Wycl., Sir John Cheke, Rh., and Dr. Campbell; wicked men, neglecting it, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *the*, close to the Greek, after Dr. Campbell, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr.



Davidson; *his*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest, which is also correct, only it need not be italicized; see on 1, 24. *husbandmen, which*: so A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; *h. that*, Rh.; see on 2, 6. — v. 42. *was made*, after Wycl., Gen., and Rh. (*is made*), but preserving the Greek aorist; *is become*, A. V. after Cran. *This was from the Lord*, close to the Greek, by a new rendering; *cometh from the Lord*, Sir John Cheke; *from the Lord did this come*, Dr. Noyes; *this is the Lord's doing*, A. V. freely, after Cran. — v. 43. *shall be taken away*, more exactly, after Rh.; *shall be taken*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *and shall be given*, more fully for the sake of dignity, after Wycl., Tynd., Gen., and Rh.; and *given*, A. V. after Cran. — v. 44. *he that*, closer to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; *whosoever*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *falleth*, closer to the Greek, after Cran. and Rh.; *shall fall*, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., and Gen. *shall be broken to pieces*, more exactly, after Cran. *nearly, shalbe broken in peces*; *shall be broken*, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., Gen., and Rh. *will scatter him as dust*, closer to the Greek, after Sir John Cheke *nearly, wil drive him lijk dust awai*; still closer in idea, *will scatter him to the winds*, Dr. Robinson (Lex. N. T.); *will grind him to powder*, A. V. after Tynd. and Gen. — v. 45. *the Pharisees*, preserving the second article, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Mr. Darby; *Pharisees*, omitting it, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; and so Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson; and it may be omitted; see on 8, 11. *heard*, to preserve the Greek aorist, after Tynd. and 1st Gen.; *had heard*, A. V. after Wycl., Cran., 2d Gen., and Rh.; see on 1, 24. — v. 46. *And (καί) when*, after Wycl. and the rest; *But when*, A. V. taking the particle here as adversative; so Dr. Campbell; see on 1, 25. *the multitudes*, to preserve the Greek plural, after Rh.; *the multitude*, A. V.

CH. XXII. v. 1. *And Jesus answered and spake*: and so A. V. and the rest; better, *And Jesus spake and said*, after Diodati and de Wette, *nearly*; *And Jesus spaak*, Sir John Cheke, simply; see on 11, 25. *again in parables unto them*, by a change of order in the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); *unto them again by parables*, A. V. after Cran. *in parables*, closer to the Greek, after Wycl., Rh., and 2d Gen.; *by parables*, A. V. by a new rendering. *saying*, close to the Greek, after Tynd., Gen., and Rh.; and *said*, A. V. after Wycl. and Cran. — v. 2. *is likened*, closer to the Greek, after Rh., and conforming to 13, 24; *is made like*,

Wycl.; is like, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *king, which*: so A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; kyng that, Wycl.; see on 2, 6. *a marriage feast*, more correctly, after Sir John Cheke; a marriage, A. V. after Cran. and Rh.; and so in vv. 3, 4, 9. — v. 3. *and* (καί) *they*: so A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; but the particle is better rendered as adversative here, but they, after 2d Gen. and Dr. Campbell; see on 1, 25. — v. 4. *them that*, after Cran., 1st Gen., and Rh.; them which, A. V. after Tynd. and 2d Gen.; see on 2, 6. *I have made ready*, after Wycl.; have prepared, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; this is the substitution of an English phrase for a Romance word; see on 1, 24. *my fatlings*, supplying but not italicizing the pronoun; *myfatlings*, A. V.; see on 1, 17. *to*, after Wycl. and Rh.; *unto*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 5. *his own*, to distinguish ἰδιος, which is commonly emphatic, from the simple genitive, as in the next clause, after Sir John Cheke; so Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; his, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; so Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*) here and in S. John 1, 41 renders ἰδιος by a simple suus. — v. 6. *the rest*, the usual form now, after Rh.; the remnant, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *laid hold on*, closer to the Greek, after Dr. Davidson nearly, laid hold of; laid hands upon, Rh.; took, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *shamefully*, after Cran.; spitefully, A. V. after Rh. *killed*, after Dr. Campbell, and conforming to 21, 39; slew, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 7. *the king*, by an omission from the text after Tischendorf and Tregelles; when the king heard *thereof* he, A. V. after Cran.; so substantially the rest; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). *sent*, close to the Greek after Wycl. and Rh.; sent forth, A. V. freely, after the rest. *burned*, after Wycl. and Rh.; burned up, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and so de Wette; more closely, set on fire, as the Vulg. *succendit*, and Germ. and Holl. Rev. — v. 8. *they that*, after Wycl. and Rh.; they which, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see on 2, 6. — v. 9. *to*, correctly, after Dr. Davidson; *into*, A. V. freely, after Wycl. and all. *the partings of the highways*, by a new rendering; the highways, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; the cross-ways, Dr. Davidson. — v. 10. *And*, close to the Greek, after Wycl., Cran., 1st Gen., and Rh.; So, A. V. freely, after 2d Gen. *was filled*, close to the Greek, after Rh.; was furnished, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 11. *But* (δέ) *when*, taking the particle in an adversative sense, after Sir John Cheke; And, A. V. after Wycl. and Rh. *to behold*, by a new rendering, to distinguish the Greek

verb used here from the one in the next clause; to view, Dr. Noyes; to look at, Dr. Davidson; to see, A. V. after Wycl., Cran., Gen., and Rh. *a man which*: so A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; a man who, Sir John Cheke; and so Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson; see on 2, 6. — v. 12. *And* (δέ), after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; but it may well be taken here as adversative, But, after Rh.; and so Mr. Darby. — v. 13. *Then the king said*, by a change of order in the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Wycl. and Rh., but against the Vulg.; Then said the king, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *and cast him*, with an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, and being supplied, after Wycl. and the rest, but not italicized; so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); take him away, and cast him, A. V. after 2d Gen. *cast him out into*, close to the Greek, after Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; cast him into, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh. *the outer darkness*, preserving the Greek article, after Rh.; outer darkness, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth*, after Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Dean Alford; see on 8, 12. — v. 14. *chosen*, for unification of the sentence, *are* omitted, after Rh. and 2d Gen.; see on 5, 11; are chosen, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; so Dean Alford; and this is more euphonious. — v. 15. *ensnare*, closer to the Greek, after Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby; entrappe, Rh.; and so Dr. Campbell; entangle, A. V. by a new rendering. — v. 16. *send to*, correcting the tense, and after Wycl. and Rh.; sent out (ἀποστέλλω) unto, A. V. after Cran. *and carest not*, after Dr. Noyes nearly, and carest for no one; and so Dr. Davidson; neither carest thou, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *any one*, by a new rendering, nearer to the Greek (τις); any man, A. V. after Wycl. and all. — v. 18. *ye hypocrites*, supplying but not italicizing *ye*; *ye hypocrites*, A. V.; see on 4, 17. — v. 21. *Render therefore*: so A. V. and all; Render then, Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Mr. Darby, which well suits the connection. *the things that*, to conform to the next clause, after Wycl. and Rh.; the things which, A. V. after Cran. — v. 22. *And when*, preserving the introductory Greek particle (καί), after Wycl., Rh. and 2d Gen.; When, A. V., omitting it, after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. *heard*, to preserve the Greek aorist, after Wycl., Tynd., and Gen.; had heard, A. V. after Cran.; see on 1, 24. *it*, supplied but not italicized, after Rh.; *these words*,

A. V. after Cran. — v. 23. *On that day*, close to the Greek, after Mr. Darby; In that day, Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson, after Wycl.; The same day, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *there came*, after Rh.; came, A. V. after Cran. Sadducees, which say, after Wycl. nearly, S. that seien; and Mr. Darby, S. who say; and so de Wette, and Germ. and Holl. Rev.; as if the article were used in the Greek (Σ. οἱ λέγοντες), but the Rev. omit the Greek article after Lachmann, Tischendorf (8th ed.), and Tregelles, with MSS. N, B, and others, and so the Curetonian Syriac; the article is read in the *Text. Rec.*, seems to have been read by the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*), *S. qui dicunt*, and was read by Tischendorf in his previous editions on the authority of MSS. E, F, G, and others; Meyer (*Com. ad h. l.*) reads the article and considers it as indispensable here; comp. Σαδδουκαῖοι, οἵτινες λέγουσιν in the parallel passage in S. Mark 12, 18; the S. which, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; S. saying, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Dr. Davidson, and the Rev. in the margin. — v. 25. *married*, to preserve the Greek aorist, after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; when he had married, A. V. by a new rendering; see on 1, 24. *seed*, to conform to v. 24, after Wycl.; issue, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 26. *in like manner*, after Rh.; Likewise, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 27. *after them all*, by a new rendering; last of all, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh. — v. 28. *In the resurrection therefore*, by a change of order in the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); Therefore in the r., A. V. after Cran. — v. 29. *But Jesus*, preserving the Greek particle (δέ adversative), after Dr. Davidson; And Jesus, Rh.; and so Mr. Darby; Jesus, A. V. — v. 30. *angels*, omitting the article as in the Greek, after Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; the angels, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and with an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; the angels of God, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). — v. 33. *multitudes*, close to the Greek, after Rh.; multitude, A. V. by a new rendering. *it*, supplied after Rh. and 2d Gen.; *this*, A. V. after Cran.; *that*, Tynd. and 1st Gen. *teaching*, as more suitable here, after Wycl.; doctrine, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 34. *the Pharisees, when*, by a new rendering; when the Pharisees, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *heard*, to preserve the Greek aorist, after Wycl.; had heard, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; see on 1, 24. *gathered themselves together*, after Sir John Cheke, taking the passive voice as a middle; came together,



Wycl. and Rh.; were gathered together, A. V. by a new rendering and literally. — v. 35. *And*, close to the Greek, after Wycl. and the rest; Then, A. V. by a new rendering<sup>g</sup> and freely. *a lawyer*, after Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; *which was a lawyer*, supplied by A. V., Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *asked him a question*, supplying but not italicizing the last three words; asked *him a question*, A. V. *tempting him*, with an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); tempting him, and saying, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 37. *And*, preserving the Greek particle, after Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; A. V. omits it, after Wycl. and all. *he*, by a change in the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; Jesus, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); see on 4, 12. — v. 38. *the great and first*, by a change of order in the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Rh., the greatest and the first, after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*), maximum et primum; the first and great commandment, A. V. after Cran. — v. 39. *a second like unto it is this*, by a new rendering, supplying and italicizing *unto it*; ther is another lyk unto this, Tynd.; There is a second like it, Dr. Noyes; the second is like unto it, A. V. after Cran. — v. 40. *hangeeth the whole law and the prophets*, after 2d Gen. *hangeeth*, after Wycl. and 1st and 2d Gen.; dependeth, Rh.; the singular verb seems to have been adopted here by the Rev. to represent the change in the text (κρέμαται), after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; *the whole law*, after 2d Gen. and Rh.; hang all the law and the prophets, A. V. after Tynd. and Cran. — v. 41. *Now while*, preserving the introductory particle (δέ continuative), by a new rendering; Wycl. and Rh., *And*; it is omitted by A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *asked them a question*, by a new rendering, and supplying but not italicizing *a question*, to conform to vv. 35 and 41; asked them, A. V. after Wycl. and all. — v. 42. *the Christ*, preserving the Greek article, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; and so de Wette and Holl. Rev.; the Messiah, Dr. Campbell; Christ, omitting the article, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so Germ. Rev.; see on 1, 17. — v. 43. *in the Spirit*, after Dr. Noyes; and so de Wette, Germ. and Holl. Rev.; in spirit, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson. — v. 44. *put—underneath thy feet*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; make—thy footstool,

after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and so nearly Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). — v. 45. *If—calleth*, after the Greek form; so Sir John Cheke and Wycl. (*clepith*); and so Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson (*calls*); call, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; and so Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby; see on 4, 3. — v. 46. *no one*, close to the Greek (*oddéis*), after Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; none, Tynd. and Gen.; and so Dr. Campbell; no man, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest.

CH. XXIII. v. 2. *on Moses' seat*, closer to the Greek (*ἐν τῇ κ. γεν.*), after Wycl. and Rh. (*upon*); in M. seat, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 3. *all things*, supplying but not italicizing *things*, after Wycl. and Rh.; All, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *bid you*, with an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); bid you observe, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *these*, newly supplied and conformed to the preceding; *that*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *do and observe*, by a change of order after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; observe and do, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). — v. 4. *yea*, after Tynd. and Cran., and with a change of text (*γάρ* to *δέ*) after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); And, Wycl. and Rh.; But, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; perhaps *Now* would be better as giving an instance of the foregoing (Meyer, *Com. ad h. l.*); For, A. V. after Gen. *them*, supplied but not italicized; *them*, A. V.; see on 1, 17. *themselves*, by change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; themselves, supplied and italicized by A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *their finger*, close to the Greek, after Wycl.; with one of their fingers, A. V. freely, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 5. *for to be seen*: and so A. V. after Tynd., Gen., and Rh.; to be—, Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; on *for to*, see on 26, 45. *for they make*, by a change of text (*δέ* to *γάρ*) after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; for, Wycl. and Rh., against the Vulgate (*vero*); and so Gen.; they make, A. V. omitting the particle (*δέ*) after Tynd. and Cran. *of their garments*, supplied and italicized, being omitted from the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; omitted also by Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); of their garments, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 6. *the chief place*, closer to the Greek, after 2d Gen.; the uppermost rooms, A. V. by a new rendering, but after Cran. nearly, the uppermost seats. — v. 7. *the salutations*,

preserving the Greek article, after Dr. Davidson ; A. V. omits it after Wycl. and all ; and so Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Mr. Darby. *salutations*, after Wycl. and Rh. ; greetings, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest ; this is the substitution of a Romance word for an English ; see on 1, 24. *the marketplaces*, after Rh. (*market-place*) ; the markets, A. V. after Tynd. and Gen. — v. 8. *Rabbi*, with an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles ; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*) ; and so Tynd. and Cran. ; *Rabbi, Rabbi*, A. V. after Gen. *teacher*, with a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, and to distinguish from v. 10, where a different Greek word is used ; after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson ; and so 2d Gen. nearly, doctor ; Master, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. *teacher*, with an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles ; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*) ; Master, *even* Christ, A. V. after Cran. — v. 9. *no man*, supplying but not italicizing *man* ; *no man*, A. V. ; see on 1, 17. — v. 9. *on*, after Wycl. ; upon, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *Father, which* : so A. V. ; fadir, that, Wycl. ; see on 2, 6. *the Christ*, preserving the Greek article, after Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson ; so Dr. Campbell, the Messiah ; and so Holl. Rev. ; Christ, A. V. after Wycl. and all ; and so de Wette, Germ. Rev., and Dean Alford ; see on 1, 17. — v. 12. *shall be humbled*, after Rh. and to conform to the next sentence ; shall be abased, A. V. after Sir John Cheke. *whosoever*, to keep close to the Greek and to conform to the preceding sentence, after 2d Gen. ; he that, A. V. — v. 13. *because*, close to the Greek (*ὅτι*), after Gen. and Rh. ; *for*, A. V. after Tynd. and Cran. *shut*, close to the Greek, after Rh. ; shut up, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *ye enter not in*, closer to the Greek, after Wycl. nearly, *ye entren not* ; *ye neither go in*, A. V. after Cran. ; this is the substitution of a Romance word for an English ; see on 1, 24. *yourselves*, supplied, as the pronoun here (*ἑαυτοῖς*) is emphatic, but not italicized ; *yourselves*, A. V. *are entering in to enter*, to keep close to the Greek, and to conform to the preceding clause, after Wycl. nearly, *entrynge to entre*. — v. 14. omitted after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles ; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*) ; Woe unto you—the greater damnation, given by A. V. after Wycl. and all ; and so the Curetonian Syriac. — v. 15. *when he is become so*, by a new rendering, but after Cran. nearly, *is become one* ; *is become such*, Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson ; so the Vulg., *cum fuerit factus*, but Sir John Cheke, it

being done; is made, A. V. after Wycl. and Rh. *a son*, omitting the definite article after the Greek, and so Wycl.; the child, A. V. supplying the article after Tynd. and the rest. *son*, close to the Greek, after Wycl.; child, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 16. *guides, which*: and so A. V. after Tynd. and Gen.; guides, that, Wycl. (*leders, that*) and Rh.; see on 2, 6. — v. 17. *Ye fools and blind*: supplying *Ye*, but not italicizing it as A. V. does; so Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; *Ye foolish and blind men*, Sir John Cheke; *Ye foolish and blinde*, Rh.; *Foolish and blind*, Dr. Campbell; and these forms, avoiding the combination of a noun and adjective, are less harsh than the first. *whether is greater*: and so A. V. by a free and idiomatic rendering of the Greek (*τίς*), after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh.; but the use of *whether* as a pronoun seems to have been rare; it occurs eight times in A. V. of N. T. and the Revisers have retained it in all these cases. It occurs but once in the O. T., Eccles. 11, 6. It is found in Shakespeare: as, *Whether dost thou profess thyself, a knave or a fool?* *All's Well*, iv. 5, 23; and in Jeremy Taylor: as, *Whether is worse, the adultery of the man or the woman?* *Holy Living*, ch. ii. §3. The Revisers have inconsistently left *which of them* [two], in S. Luke 7, 42 (*Whether*, Rh.), and *whom* [of the two] in S. Matt. 27, 17 (*Whether*, Tynd., Cran., and Gen.); and *which* was not unfrequently so used; *guhiche of thaim*, *Life of Davison*, p. 71; *which* [of the two] *shall hearken unto other*, Hooker, v. 7; *which of the two*, *ib.* v. 42; *which of these two opinions*, *ib.* v. 62; *lets try which* [of us two] *can catch the first fish*, Walton, *Angler*, p. 124; *You shall chuse which* [of the two] *shall be your angle*, *ib.* p. 120. So again in v. 19; see also on 9, 5. *hath sanctified*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, rendering an aorist by the perfect, after Dean Alford; but Dr. Davidson, close to the Greek, *sanctified*; *sanctifieth*, A. V. after Wycl. (*halewith*), and all; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); see on 2, 2. — v. 18. *is a debtor*, after Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; *owith*, Wycl.; *is bound*, Rh.; *is guilty*, A. V. after Cran. — v. 19. *Ye blind*, with an omission from the text after Tischendorf and Tregelles, and supplying but not italicizing *Ye*, after Wycl. (*Blynde men*) and Rh.; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); *Ye fools and blind*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 20. *He—that*, closer to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; *Whoso*, A. V. after Cran. *sweareth*, rendering an aorist participle as present, after Wycl. and the rest; *shall swear*, A. V. freely and by a new



rendering; and so in vv. 21 and 22. — v. 22. *the heaven*, preserving the Greek article, by a new rendering; heaven, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so Dr. Campbell and all; and this seems better; see on 6, 26. — v. 23. *Ye tithe*, after Wycl. and the rest; Ye pay tithe of, A. V. by a new rendering. *have left undone*, to conform to the last clause of the verse, after Sir John Cheke nearly, leve undone; and so Tynd. and 1st Gen.; have omitted, A. V. by a new rendering; this is a case of the substitution of an English for a Romance word; see on 4, 12. *matters*, supplied, after A. V., but not italicized; see on 1, 17. *and mercy*, preserving the Greek particle, after Wycl., Rh., and 2d Gen.; mercy, A. V. omitting it, after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. *but these*, by an addition to the text after Lachmann and Tregelles; these, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*). *ye ought*, by a change of order after Rh.; ought ye, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; and so Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; and this seems better. *to have left*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Tynd., Gen., and Rh. — v. 24. *guides, which*: and so A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; guides, that, Rh.; see on 2, 6. *strain out the gnat*, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; strain at a gnat, A. V. probably by a misprint (Archbp. Trench on Revision *ad h. l.*). *the gnat—the camel*, preserving the Greek article, after Sir John Cheke; and so Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; a gnat—a camel, A. V. omitting it, after Wycl. and all; and so Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes. — v. 25. *cleanse*, to conform to v. 26, and after Wycl., Tynd., and Cran.; make clean, A. V. after Gen. and Rh. *from extortion*, by a new rendering close to the Greek (*ἐξ*); of e., A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so Dr. Campbell and all; pleni sunt rapinâ, Vulg. — v. 26. *Thou blind Pharisee*, supplying but not italicizing *Thou*; *Thou blind P.*, A. V.; see on 1, 17. *the inside of*, closer to the Greek, after Tynd., Gen., and Rh., and to conform to the preceding verse, and to the succeeding clause; that *which is* within, A. V. after Cran. *thereof*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; of them, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; *may become* (*γίνῃται*), after Rh.; be made, Wycl.; may be, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; see on 15, 28. *also*, a case of good but free order; and so A. V., this word belonging to *the outside*; see on 2, 8. — v. 27. *outwardly*, omitting the Greek particle (*μὲν*), after Wycl., Tynd., Gen., and Rh.; outwardly indeed, Dr. Noyes, exactly; outward indeed, Dr. Campbell; which indeed, A. V.

preserving the particle, but adopting a free order, after Cran.; and so in v. 28. outwardly, after Rh.; outward, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *inwardly*, after Rh. and to conform to the preceding; within, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so in v. 28. — v. 29. *for* (ὅτι), after Sir John Cheke and Gen.; and so Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson, they making ὅτι and γάρ interchange; because, A. V. after Rh.; and so Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Dean Alford. *sepulchres*, after Wycl. and Rh.; tombs, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *tombs*, after Sir John Cheke; sepulchres, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 30. *should not have been*, after Wycl. and correctly; would not have been, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 31. *ye witness to*, after Dean Alford nearly, ye witness unto; iou witness of, Sir John Cheke; ye be witnesses unto, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *sons*, close to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; the children, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *them that*, after Wycl. and Rh.; them which, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *slew*, after Wycl.; killed, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 33. *ye serpents, ye offspring*, supplying but not italicizing *ye—ye*; *ye—ye*, A. V.; see on 1, 17. *offspring*, after Sir John Cheke; and so Dr. Campbell and Mr. Darby; generation, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *shall ye escape* (φύγετε, deliberative subjunctive); will you flee, Rh.; shuld ye scape, Tynd. and Gen.; can ye escape, A. V. by a new rendering. *the judgement of hell*, after Rh.; and so Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson; the doom of helle, Wycl.; helles ponischment, Sir John Cheke; the punishment of hell, Dr. Noyes; the damnation of hell, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. The verb *to damn* and its derivatives *damnation* and *damnably* were used 15 times in N. T. by A. V., but these words have been utterly excluded by the Revisers, even in cases where the terms of the original must be taken in their fullest and strongest sense: as, S. Mark 16, 16, He that believeth—shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned; and S. John 5, 29, the resurrection of life—the resurrection of damnation. If any passages in which these words were used by A. V. mean merely *moral judgment* concerning what is evil, in such passages *to condemn* and *condemnation* would be properly adopted; but for such passages as those just adduced, *to damn* and *damnation* are the technical and established terms, and they seem harsh words simply because they are the technical and established terms for this dreadful idea, and no human influence nor length of time would be able to banish the use of them. Moreover, were *to judge* or *to condemn* to become

the technical and established term for this dreadful idea, the word would in the course of time take upon itself the dreadful association which *to damn*, originally used in the ordinary sense of *to condemn*, has now in the course of time taken upon itself. — v. 34. *Therefore*, closer to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; Wherefore, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *some*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so the Vulg. (*Cod. Am.*); so Dr. Campbell; and *some*, A. V. after Wycl. and all. *some—some*, supplied but not italicized; *some—some*, A. V.; see on 1, 17. *shall ye kill*, by a new order to conform to the next clause; ye shall kill, A. V. after Wycl. and all. *persecute*, after Wycl., Tynd., Gen., and Rh.; persecute *them*, A. V. supplying the pronoun after Cran. — v. 35. *on the earth*, after Wycl.; upon the earth, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *Abel the righteous*, by change of order, close to the Greek, after Rh., Abel the just; righteous Abel, A. V. after Wycl. (*just Abel*) and all. *Zachariah—Barachiah*, to conform to the Hebrew; Zacharias—Barachias, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see on 1, 2. *the sanctuary*, by a more exact rendering here, after Dr. Campbell; the temple, A. V. after Wycl. and all. — v. 37. *which killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her*, preserving the 3d person of the Hebraism in the Greek, after Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby; *thou that killest—and stonest—sent unto thee*, A. V. changing the person to make it agree with what follows, after Wycl. and all. *Jerusalem, which*, after Tynd., Gen., and Rh.; J. that, A. V. after Wycl. and Cran.; see on 2, 6. *them that*, after Wycl. and Rh.; them which, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see as above. *her wings*, the article having here the force of a possessive; *her wings*, A. V. not recognizing this usage; see on 1, 24.

CHARLES SHORT.

## II.—PHILLIPPS GLOSSARY.<sup>1</sup>

### O

Obodruus amator.

Obuaricator dicitur qui alicui  
occurrens a recto eum itinere  
declinat.

Obesus pinguis. Obesat in-  
pinguat.

5. Oblixus summissus.

Oblisus illisus.

Obstringilli dicuntur quedam  
calciamenta per plantas consuta  
et ex superiori parte corrigia  
constricta unde et a constringen-  
do obstringilli uocantur qui  
uulgo scapini dicuntur.

Obsicus turpis ludus et impu-  
dicus.

Obtutus fixus et immobilis in-  
tuitus.

10. Oblegatum iniunctum  
mandatum.

Oblegat contradicit contra  
legem uenit.

Obit moritur contrauadit Sen-

eca non sum tam superbus ut  
curationes eger obeam 'i' im-  
probe damnem.

Obsonat discordat dissonat  
absonat.

Obsonitat conuiciatur.

15. Obsolefactus dicitur qui  
per neglectum deprauatur trans-  
lato nomine a domibus que per  
incuriam situ obsolete dicuntur.  
Obsoleta enim loca domus que  
non habitata sordescunt uel ea  
que per neglectum non emun-  
dantur.

Obiurare iuramento sese ob-  
stringere.

Oculissimus carissimus quasi  
oculus.

O<sup>c</sup>culit abscondit debet autem  
per duo cc scribi licet eius  
primitivum 'i' oculus per unum.  
Nam propter oculum omnia oc-  
culuntur.

20. Ocines dicuntur aues que

<sup>1</sup> The following misprints in the former excerpts from the Phillipps Glossary (VI., pp. 451-461 of this Journal) should be corrected:

M 13. Maugeo for mangeo.

M 14. Malaxatus for malaxater, malaxare for malaxan.

M 27. Mactina gida for machama quida.

M 37. Macianum for maliarum.

M 41. Malleorum for malleonum.

M 70. Perhibetur for pertubitur (?).

M 88. Nevius.

M 108. Monimentum.

M 113. Mortinum morticinum for matinum morticorium.

N 11. Noctiosus for noctiorus.

N 13. Noviplum for noniplum.



ore et cantu auspiciū faciunt ut coruus cornix picus.

Oclifera quedam ornamenta que in fronte suspenduntur.

Occiduo multorum occisio. Occiduo occiduonis.

Ocinum siue ochinus est herba de qua emilius macer ait Inter preteritas numerabitur ochinus herbas.

25. Octauia dicitur porticus priuata.

Octauiana uero publica.

Occatio dicitur cum ruricola satione completa bobus omissis glebas ligone conminuit. dicitur que occatio quasi obcecatio eo quod operiat semina. Inde dicitur occa ager non procul ab oppidis ligonibus magis utens quam vomere uel aratris.

Oceanus est mare magnum mediam diuidens terram ipsamque circumdans ac reciprocis estibus in se reuertens. dicit autem quidam in profundis oceani quosdam esse meatus uentorum uelut quasdam mundi nares per quas emissi anhelitus et retracti alterno accessu et recessu nunc euaporante spiritu efflent maria nunc sorbente reducant. Sunt qui dicant lunari incremento crescere oceanum, ut tanquam quibusdam eius spirationibus rursum trahatur et iterum eiusdem impulsu ac retractu in mensuram propriam refundatur. Alii dicunt solem et sydera aqua(m) de oceano haurire ignibus suis et circa

omnia sydera fundere ad sui temperamentum. Inde est inquit quod cum aquas haurit erigit oceanum. Vnde Lucanus (IX 313, 4) Et rapidus Tytan ponto sua lumina pascens Equora subduxit zone uicina peruste. Sed utrum uentorum spiritu an lunari cursu increcant aque an sole attrahente aquas ille decrescant soli deo cognitum est. (More of this, which is here omitted.)

Offerumenta dicuntur ea quae offeruntur.

30. Officiperdi est nomen indeclinabile compositum ab officio et perdo is significans officium perditum.

Odidoscos (l. Odoidocos) latro uiarum obsessor.

Ollic antiqui dicebant pro illic et olli pro illi Virgilius olli subridens diuum pater atque hominem rex.

Onolyras interpretatur asinus ad lyram.

Oppiter diues dicitur uel qui diuitiis praeest. Hic oppiter huius oppiteris. Oppiter dictus est Saturnius quasi opum pater. Oppiter etiam uocatur cuius pater mortuus est auo superstite. Oppiter enim dicitur eo quod auum ob patrem habeat.

35. Optomoyci dicuntur qui quantum recipiunt tantum emittunt.

Opiparium dicitur magnarum opum apparatus.

Opipare ditare nobilitare uel

opulentum conuiuium instruere.

Oppipare post plantum epulari opipare delicate. Opizare est minuere a greco opizin. Inde opici dicuntur qui quasi frangendo uerba minuunt. Quidam autem dicunt hoc nomen ab ope sumptum i<sup>1</sup> terra quae corpora cuncta minuit.

40. Opitularia auxilia.

Oppedere est contra ire pedem contra ponere.

Oriundus dignus ortu significans eum qui ortus est suis natalibus optime conuenire.

Orcus dicitur mors sive infernus et interpretatur iurans uel capiens quia animas quas semel ceperit sic retinet quasi iurauerit se numquam eas in perpetuum redditurum.

<sup>1</sup> Orbus cecus orbus filiis quasi orbibus i<sup>1</sup> oculis priuatus Orbatus proprie dicitur patre aut matre aut uxore aut filia sive alialibet cara persona priuatus quasi amisso lumine oculorum.

45. Orbus quoque dicitur quoddam genus leguminis. Orbus etiam dicitur sulcus aratri.

Orculus presagium.

Orcius vas quoddam ab orca dictus (l. dictum). Orca enim genus anphore est. Inde minori uocabulo orcius. diminutiuo orcellus et orceolus.

Ordeolus dicitur paruissima et purulenta collectio in palpebris ordei grano similis. (Here

follows a long extract from a grammarian showing that *ordeicius* is wrongly written by some *ordeaceus*.)

Orcista (l. orcestra) pulpitu erat scene ubi saltator agere posset ac duo inter se disputare. Ibi enim poete comedi et tragedi ad certamen considebant hisque canentibus alii gestus edebant.

50. Os ossis quod nos modo dicimus antiqui declinabant hoc ossum huiusossi. Quidam tamen dicebant hoc ossu ab hoc ossu sicut hoc cornu ab hoc cornu Vnde etiam consequenter genituum pluralem dicebant horum ossuum iuxta regulam nominum quarte declinationis. Quaecumque enim nomine ablatiuo casu singulari in u fuerunt terminata genituum pluralem in uu sillabas mittunt.

P

Pater patrinus (*sic*) dicitur qui patrem habet cum et ipse pater sit.

Patriaster patrens (l. parens) i<sup>1</sup> uitricus dictus eo quod loco patris esse debeat filiastro.

Parricida dicitur non solum qui patrem sed etiam qui matrem fratrem aut sororem occiderit.

Pagario princeps pagi.

5. Panagericum (l. Panagiricum) dicitur quoddam genus dicendi in laudibus regum licentiosum et laciniosum mendacis et adulationibus plenum.

<sup>1</sup> Here it is obvious the Glossary has preserved far more of the original than Paulus, p. 183, 2, 3.

Paleatus ueste pulla indutus.

Pandus apertus a pando dis pandus componitur repandus 'i' recuruus conuexus sinuatus.

Patapolos (l. Pantopoles) grece dicitur negotiator qui latine seplassurus (? seplasiarius) uocatur.

Pacifer legatus pacis.

10. Plancus dicitur qui supra modum planos habet pedes. Plance enim sunt tabule late et plane.

Patrus seductor.

Paticus mollis catamita concubinus.

Praucors sive prauicordius dicitur homo prauī cordis.

Particus negotiator.

15. Plagiarius dicitur mancipiorum uel servorum alienorum distractor Plagarius uero est cirurgus 'i' plagarum curator.

Pantomimus iocularis 'i' qui per omnia corporis membra gesticulatur ita ut totus uideatur compositus ad ioculandum.

Parasitus dicitur glutto quasi ad ingluuiem semper paratus a quo diminuitur parasis\*ter (l. parasitaster).

Parte ferox dicitur capite minax.

Pacomus infirmus uel deiectus.

20. Pallex grece dicitur adolescens. Pallex dicitur pellex 'i' adulter.

Pallens luridus 'i' pallidus.

Patromissus patronus patronissa patrona.

Patrocinor illi et illum dicitur 'i' protego.

Palpo cecus a palpando dictus palpo nis.

25. Palpare est manu attrectare. Palpare tangere.

*Plautus* (filled in subsequently) languens pedes.

Parabata cupidus.

Palestrita pugil qui in palestra pugnat qui et palestrites dicitur uel per sincopam palestres. Palestra enim grece lucta.

Patagium est illud quod ad summam tunicam assuitur ex purpura et auro uariatum unde et ipsa patagiata dicitur et patagiarius artifex.

30. Pannulie dicuntur que per telam discurrunt eo quod inde panni texantur.

Panus lignum in quo trame sunt.

Palpe sunt membra dorsi eminentia dextra leuaque.

Patulum et patens hoc differunt quod patulum dicitur quod claudi non potest patens uero quod apertum (l. opertum) recludi potest.

Pratum dicitur quasi paratum a subtracta Nam in araturis segelum et culturis *uinearum* [this word filled in later] et virgultorum multum laboratur antequam fructus proueniat quod prata sibi non exigunt.

35. Paries a parilitate dicitur quia duo sunt parietes in lateribus domus altrinsecus sibi ex equo respondententes.

Parietina parietum ruina sine domo et habitatore.

Palumbis (*is* after an erasure) generis est feminini palumbes masculini Virgilius. In uiridi ramo gemine sedere palumbes Lucius uero ait macrosque palumbos.

Parias est serpens inflexuosus et in sola cauda incedens. Unde lucanus Et contentus iter cauda sulcante parias.

Platasan grece dicuntur montium altitudines.

40. Plante et plantaria hoc distant plante sunt rapte de arboribus.

Plantaria uero dicuntur que ex seminibus nata sunt et cum radicibus euulsa alibi transplantantur.

Palate sunt masse que de ficorum fructibus fieri et conpingi solent quas in palis ad solem siccant ut seruentur in annum est autem nomen grecum.

Palmula est extrema pars remi a similitudine palme dicta de qua Virgilius Litus ama et leuas prestringat palmula cautes.

Phale et phalarice sunt bellice turres uel machine que muris applicite frequentibus eos pulsan balistis.

45. Psalterion grece dicitur sambuca inde psalmicen et

psalmista quod est idem et psalmus et psallo lis li Vnde Bassus Calliope princeps sapienti psallerat ore.

Palates lateres.

Pancrorium planatorium.

Pangatorium plantatorium.

Platoma tabula lapidea.

50. Plangula est frenum.

*Patilla* (filled in later) receptaculum ignis cum manubrio quo portatur longior quam rotundior.

Pancratium locus ubi pugnatur ad bestias.

Pancratiarius pugil.

Pancratiari tormentari uel bestiis tradi.

55. Parium est marmor candidum a paron (l. paro) insula dictum unde uenit de quo poeta. Olearon niueamque paron sparsasque per equor Cycladas et crebris legimus freta concita uentis. Paron niueam dixit ob niueum marmor quod mittit.

<sup>1</sup> Paracaraximus falsus nummus.

Patrium nomen est quod a patria sumitur ut romanus thebanus.

Patria autem dicitur quantum sub unius ciuitatis ditione continetur.

Pauire ferire inde pauimentum.

(37) Some error has got in here. Vergil is quoted both by Charisius 106 K. and Nonius 219 as using *palumbis* feminine; and in both the masculine *palumbus* is ascribed to Lucilius with the quotation *macrosque palumbos*.

(43) Aen. V 163, where *stringat sine* takes the place of *praestringat*.

(55) Aen. III 126, where Ribbeck's MSS give *terris*.

<sup>1</sup>A word occurring in the glosses of the Bodl. Persius, Auct. F. I, 15, fol. 88a.



60. Paragoge est appositio quedam ad finem dictionis littere uel sillabe ut magies pro magis dicier pro dici. Perseus (l. Persius) ut pulchrum est digito ostendi et dicier hic est.

Pax quando nomen est a uocalem producit quando aduerbium corripit et significat statim uel ut alii dicunt tantummodo. Pax autem ideo singulariter tantum declinatur quoniam si diuidatur non erit pax.

Pandus apertus recuruus a pando dis. Inde per compositionem repandus da dum 'i' reflexus.

Pargo spargo parsa sparsa.

Parumper ualde parum.

65. Panaretos dicitur ecclesiasticus quasi totus uirtutibus plenus. Pan enim grece totum ares uirtus.

Pandectes dicitur codex nouum ac uetus continens testamentum.

Plaustrit quod de plaustro sonat.

Plausile et plausibile idem 'i' fauorabile.

70. Paragorizat mitigat oblectat temperat.

Pseudographus scriptor mendax pseudo enim grece falsus grafia scriptura. Pseudomeni mendaces.

Precupidus preproperus in maturus preceps prefestinus pre rapidus preuelox.

75. Pres fidedictor pres dans predam (? predem) pres dis.

Preditus sublimatus.

Pretor dicitur quasi preceptor uel quasi preitor qui preest urbi qui et edilis uocatur eo quod edibus presit.

Preopimus ualde optimus (l. opimus).

Prestigiator incantator ludificator prestigiare ludificare a prestringendo dictum eo quod huiusmodi fantasia intuentium oculos prestringat ut species eis quedam appareant que non sunt sed esse uidentur. prestigium ii et prestigia e 'i' fantastica ludificatio.

80. Pernix uelox omnis generis pernix tior simus perniciousius sime Dirivatur autem a uerbo quod est pernitor eris uel ut alii dicunt a uerbo quod est perneo es unde pernitius.

Petula meretrix.

Penitus secretus penitus tantum Vnde Apuleius Visus est ei adolescens quasi ad nuptias trahere se in penitiorem partem domus 'i' secretiorem.

Prestes presul.

Pedissequa communis generis est quamuis et pedissecus dicitur 'i' sequipes quod similiter commune est.

85. Preuius precessor.

Perduellis hostis ad bellum pertinax perduellio bellum dicitur autem perduellio et per-

(82) Charis., p. 85 K. Penitus penitior. Apuleius in I Hermagorae Visus est et adolescens honesta forma quasi ad nuptias exornatus trahere se in penitiorem partem domus.

duellis interdum indifferenter is qui bello pertinaciter insistit sicut rebellis et rebellio idem dicitur.

Preclius dicitur precellens a uerbo quod est precluo i precello.

Pellicator fraudator.

Pellitus pellibus indutus Vnde Xtianus quidam poeta ait. Pellitos habitus sumpsit uenerabilis adam.

Pelletarius pellifex utrumque a pellibus dictum licet alterum per unum l scribant alterum per duo.

Petus guelcus habens oculos aliquantulum declinatos de quo oratius At pater ut nati sic nos debemus amici si quod sit uitium non fastidire strabonem appellat petum pater.

Pedidus sordidus obsoletus a pueris dictus quod a sordibus abstinere nesciant in tali etate pedes enim grece pueri dicuntur.

Pedalis cursor.

Peculator peculii fur peculiari enim est de publico peculio furari.

Peticus sive petilius appetitor alieni.

Peritus doctus a uerbo quod est perior periris.

Pelices dicuntur tam mares quam femine aliis ad stuprum succumbentes. pelices riuales. dicitur autem pelex a uerbo quod est pelliceo ces sive pellicio tercie coniugationis quod idem est. pellicere est illicere circumuenire illecebrare. Pelliceo autem dicitur pro perliceo r in l conuersa sic pellego pro perlego pelluceo pro perluceo unde plautus Agedum istum ostende quem lenam conscripsisti syngraphum inter me et amicam et leges pellege. Idem Ita pellucet quasi laterna punica. Pellicio autem dicitur quasi pelli (altered half to pelle) illicio. Inde pellex meretrix dicitur quasi pellens componens. dicitur etiam pellex sive pallax dolosus.

Preripium locus super ripas.

100. Pecudes tantum oues dicimus pecora autem mixturam omnium animalium hec pecus dis hoc pecus uel pecor ris. pecua pecus femina. pecuaria pecudum greges. pecuarius pecudum custos pecusius hoc ipsum. pecuinus stultus a pecude dictus. pecuatus similiter stolidus.

(90) Prudent. Psych. 226, where *Pellitosque*.

(98) Priscian. I, p. 50 K. In compositis tamen quibusdam inuenio r in l conuerti, ut intellego et pelliceo pro interlego et perlicio, pellego pro perlego, pelluceo pro perluceo. Plautus in asinaria Agedum istum ostende quem conscripsisti syngraphum Inter me et amicam et lenam, leges pellege. *Conscripsisti* is, of course, *conscripsi*; but the MSS of Plautus, as well as Nonius 225, all write *conscripsisti*. Then follows Idem in eadem Ita pellucet quasi lanterna Punica.

Peculatus dicitur furtum publicum a pecude sicut et a pecunia eo quod antiqui nichil nisi pecora habebant.

Perdix avis perdix quoque perditio dicitur. pro aue hic perdix cis pro perditione hec perdix cis.

Pennirapus uelociter uolans.

Pessus morbi corruptio.

105. Perpendium est plumbum uel linea cementarii unde materies perpenditur. Inde per diminutionem perpendiculum et perpendiculator i. cementarius.

Plecta cratis.

Pellicidium tesorium lacrimarum.

Pegma pars capitis. Pegma genus machinamenti in theatris unde iuuenalis Et pegma et pueros inde ad uelitaria raptos.

Pedum baculus recuruus pugilum fastis Vnde Virgilius. At tu sume pedum.

110. Pectenatum dicitur tectum instar pectinis in duas partes diuisum ut testudinatum in quatuor.

Pelium templum diane.

Pergula parua tuguris in alto posita.

Peculium proprie dicitur pars substantie domini seruo separata ex ipsius domini arbitrio ad negotiandum.

115. Plebiscitum dicitur quod prius senatores constituunt et

postea ad plebis noticiam et approbationem defertur.

Plebiscitat plebem alloquitur.

Peripsima est grecum nomen et dicitur peripsima uilis metallorum rasura uel quicquid illud de qualibet materie terebrando uel dolando uel scabificando abicitur.

Perfluies est sordium effusio.

Penuria paupertas dicta eo quod pene minus sit quam necesse est.

120. Pheos grece claritas dicitur Inde phebus i. sol et phebe i. luna Lucanus Iam phebe toto fratrem cum redderet orbe terrarum subita percussa expalluit umbra dicunt enim stoici omnem terram montibus circumcludi quorum umbra fieri ut subito luna non appareat.

Pedic(?) tatus filiorum uel nepotum propagatio.

Pedor squalor unde Lucanus longusque in carcere pedor. Pedor pedum fetor. Pedora aurium sordes.

Prepria palma uictoria.

Periculum ad discrimen pertinet Periculum ad experimentum.

125. Perpera macula uel mala fama Perperus peruersus perperam peruerse.

Percunctatio et interrogatio ita distinguuntur quia ad percunctionem multa responderi pos-

(108) Juv. IV 122.

(109) Ecl. V 88.

(120) Luc. I 538, 9.

(122) Luc. II 73.

sunt ad interrogationem uero est et non.

Peredia edendi auiditas.

Perdax fallax.

Pepulum speculum.

130. Petilansura alba equi ungula.

Peda humanum uestigium.

Perfunctorium dicitur quasi <sup>enl</sup> iam expleto non sit inmorandum a uerbo quod est perfungor geris dictum quod est peruti Perfunctorie transitorie negligeriter imaginarie.

Perifrastici dies dicuntur dies hiberni.

Presagmina dicuntur partes corporis incise.

135. Penera dicuntur res necessarie ad cotidianum uictum.

Penarius locus ubi reponuntur.

Penetrare domus interior ut et dedit terra eorum ranas inpenetralibus r. i. ubi male quidam inpenetrabilibus r. i. Virgilius At regina pyra penetrati in sede sub auras.

Periodus est tota sententia Inde faustus in commentariis Voluitur hec longis sententia sub periodis.

Presulat epulatur.

140. Plemmi (? Plemini) sunt callosi in pedibus uel manibus.

Pilosi qui grece panite latine incubi sine incubones uocantur satyri sunt siluestres uidelicet

homines uel potius hominum monstra quorum forma ab humana quidem specie incipit sed in bestialem finitur. qui adeo sepe improbi in mulieris existunt ut cum illis concumbant. hos galli dusios uocant quos romani faunos appellant unde oratius Faune siluarum *to* incedas.

Psilli (under this a long passage of Lucan is quoted which fills 1½ columns, nearly).

Pinnipotens dicitur gladiator fortis a pyn greco quod est acutum.

Piraterium habitaculum piratarum.

145. Piraterium quoque dicitur experimentum.

Polimitarii consilarii multi.

Pileta fur.

Pitatia siue pitatie dicuntur palestra sulc<sup>a</sup> tacones membranularum incisurae Inde per diminutionem pitaciola.

Pirus arbor pirum eius pomum Inde dicitur pirula extrema pars nasi eo quod piro forma similis sit.

150. Ptisana est cortex quer-nus que in pila contunditur ad coria confitienda Ptisana etiam dicitur ordeum pila contusum Ptisanarium uas in quo contunditur.

Pyri sunt turrita quedam edificia.

(138) Aen. IV 504.

(148) A gloss, *Palestra s. luctationes*, seems to have got in in a corrupted form.



Piramide(s) sunt quedam sepulchra quadrata et fastigiata ultra omnem altitudinem que manu fieri potest.

Pilum genus teli uel hasta. Vnde lucanus. Signa pares aquilas et pila minantia pilis Idem umbone repellitur umbo et clipei clipeis et pila minantia pilis Inde pinulus dicitur qui primum telum portat 'i' signifer qui et primipilus et primipilaris nuncupatur.

Primipilares quoque dicuntur qui primum pilum secuntur.

155. Pilanus pistor.

Plica decipula dolus a plico cas Inde per compositionem simplex quasi sine plica.

Psicomachia est pugna inter uirtutes et uitia que fit in anima.

Pignate sunt plage retis uel uincula quibus capiuntur fere uel aues.

Pinnirapus retiator uel gladiator.

160. Pirgus uas in quo tessere currunt. unde et pirgus dicitur quasi pergus unde oratius Mitteret in pirgum talos mercede diurna Pirgi quoque dicuntur signa alearum in quibus alee ponuntur.

Primacerces (? Prima technes) fundamenta artis.

Pinnula summa pars auris pinnam enim greci dicunt acutum. Pinnula quoque dicitur bipennis.

Pinna fastigium templi quod per diminutionem pinnaculum dicitur.

Propaginare est propagines 'i' flagella uitis terre summissa sternere et quasi protendere.

165. Propago cum ad homines pertinet corripit primam cum uero ad alias res producit.

Procare sive procari est instantanter petere. Inde et nuptiarum petitores proci uocantur et procaces meretrices 'i' importune petentes.

Procudit fabricat Virgilius durum procudit aratrum.

Promulgare novum aliquid statuere in commune et quasi prouulgare.

Poetria ars poetandi Poetida qui dat poetandi precepta poeta qui agit secundum artem.

170. Proserpere germinare crescere.

Postulo et posco ita distinguuntur postulatur modeste poscitur improbe unde Cicero Incipiunt postulare poscere minari primo uidelicet postulare honeste deinde procaciter poscere non impetrantes minari.

(153) Luc. I 7. The following extract is from Stat. T. VIII 398: Iam clipeus clipeis, umbone repellitur umbo, Ense minax ensis, pede pes et cuspide cuspis. For *pinulus* perhaps *primulus*; cf. M. Warren's S. Gallen Glossary, P 341, *primulum numerus militie primo probatus*.

(158) Psychomachia is the name of one of Prudentius's poems.

(168) Verg. G. I 261, durum procudit arator Vomeris obtunsi dentem.

(171) Verr. III 78.

Popularis arrogans superbus  
populo semper admixtus.

Proheres dicitur qui loco  
heredis fungitur.

Proscos uicinus Proscos pros-  
pector uel provisor rerum Inde  
per diminutionem Prosculus.

175. Propudiosum rubore et  
confusione plenum.

Propino uapa elluo.

Propina meretrix Iuuenalis  
qui meminit calide sapiat quid  
u. po Propina quoque dicitur  
culina exculentior.

Popisma est nouissima pars  
coitus.

Protus citus.

180. Plotus dicitur qui planos  
et latos habet pedes.

Proteruus improbus contumax  
Inde proteruo is quod est con-  
tendere. tullius in rethoricis  
quare sic proteruis?

Polilogus multiloqus uer-  
bosus.

*Proscude* (filled in later) mer-  
etrices que ante stabula sedent  
sed earum lupanaria *prosceuda*  
(filled in later) uocantur.

Prodigiator dicitur prodigio-  
rum interpres.

185. Poliorchetes dicitur ciuis

destruere urbis polis enim ciuitas  
orche destruere uel excidere.

Prostibulata prostituta.

Pollis farina aqua conspersa  
hic pollis pollinis et hoc pollen  
huius pollinis.

Popa crassa caro.

Postela dicitur ornamentum  
equi post sellam sicut antela  
ante sellam.

190. Potus interdum ponitur  
pro potatus sicut lassus pro las-  
satus lacerus (*sic*) pro laceratus  
saucius pro sauciatus uel ut aliis  
placet poto tas facit supinum  
tam potum quam potatum unde  
consequenter uerbale nomen  
tam poter quam potator parti-  
cipiale autem tam potus quam  
potatus Virgilius Tyture (*u m.*  
*sec.*) dum redeo breuis est uia  
pasce capellas Et potum pastas  
age tyture Idem Huc ipsi po-  
tum uenient. Oratius Potores  
bibuli media de nocte falerni.

Pomones custodes pomo-  
rum.

Polumum locus sacrorum.

Propine grece dicuntur sta-  
tiones nundine argisteria. est  
autem locus iuxta balnea ubi  
post lavachrum a fame et siti  
reficiuntur. unde et propina

(177) It is doubtful whether the quotation from Juv. XI 81 is meant as an illustration of *properia meretrix*, in which case it would be a v. l., so far as I know, not found in MSS; or *poperia* has fallen out before the quotation. The fact that in this citation the word is written *po*. need only prove that it was accommodated to the ordinary text.

(178) Observe this follows immediately after *Propina*. Both were taken from Juvenal.

(181) This fragm. of Cicero I have not been able to find.

(183) For *Prosedae*.

(190) Ecl. IX 24, VII 11.

locus hic dicitur eo quod famen tollat.

Prorostra dicuntur fora eo quod captis nauibus Cartaginiensium rostra inde ablata sunt et in foro romano prefixa ob insigne uictorie.

195. Profundum dicitur quod longe habeat fundum.

Postica et posticum et posticum idem Oratius Atria seruantes postico falle clientam. Est autem posticum cuniculus ostium latens et a publico remotum.

Propostus forum statio mercatorum ubi uenalia proponuntur.

Progestium suburbanum.

Proscenia dicuntur pulpita ante scenam.

200. Proscenia theatralia Vnde Virgilius ueteres ineunt proscenia ludi.

Promurium spacium circa murum.

Procestria dicuntur que procedunt in muro. Procastria uero que ante castra sunt.

Postes dicuntur eo quod post fores stent.

Pronexium est funis quo nauis in litore ad palum ligatur.

205. Pons in nauali certamine dicitur scala nauium.

Portemia genus naucule.

Pontonium quoddam genus nauigii latum et graue.

Prosumia genus nauigii.

Pupula est media pars oculi in qua est uis tota uidendi cuius diminutivum est pupilla.

210. Procerium sporta manualis.

Pople siue poplites dicuntur eo quod postplicam faciant. hic poplis poplitis. poplites hominum sunt. suffragines animalium.

Postliminium reuersio de exilio ut qui ante eliminatus fuerat iterum intra limina recipiatur. unde et postliminium dicitur quasi post limen.

Podex anus.

Podex impetus qui fit per anum.

215. Posculus tenebre noctis.

Prouium facile planum.

Pulices dicuntur quod ex puluere maxime nutriantur. Inde pulicari quod est pulices occidere et per compositionem expulcor aris quod est idem.

Pulpa dicitur caro trita et mollis pulpa est caro macra dicta a palpitando sepe enim resilit; uel ut aliis uidetur pulpa a pulte dicitur quia cum pulte conmixta olim edebatur. Pulmentum quoque et pulmentarium quod idem est dicitur a pulte. siue enim sola pultis siue quod eius permixtione sumatur pulmentum dicitur. Pulita quoque dicitur a pulte.

Putus dicitur ferrum quo vites putantur.

220. Pultare est pulsare. Vnde Terentius Quid iam cessas pultare ostium uicini?

Pumilii molles et enerues a pumice dicti Pumex enim lapis spongiosus unde libri poliuntur dictus quod spume densitate concretus fiat tante frigiditatis ut in uase mistus cum musto mustum faciat non feruere.

Publii apud romanos uocabantur qui post mortem parentum remanent publici quasi pusilli.

## R

Ramex dicitur a ramo de quo poeta Iacet exiguus cum ramice neruus.

Rauium antiqui raucitatem dicebant unde et uerbum fit rauio rauias.

Raucedo et raucitas sunt idem. est autem amputatio uocis que et artheriasis dicitur. quia fit ab artheriarum iniuria.

Rauceo cis et rauceo ces idem Raucio cis facit preteritum rausi Raucus autem est nomen tonneson. dicitur enim raucus et male et bene canens Vnde et rauciones cigni in italia dicuntur.

5. Raua dicitur uox rauca Inde causicus loquax et litigiosus rauilla siue rauula nuncupatur.

Rabula rabidus proteruus litigiosus.

Raubirius latro.

Refractor refragator 'i' reluctantans contradictor peruicax.

Reses remissus ignauus ociosus piger Resides proprie dicuntur qui milicie detrectantes domi resident.

10. Resupinus superbus retrorsum capite inclinato se gerens quod est signum superbie.

Regium proprie dicitur quod regis est Regale quod regi dignum.

Remascellatum 'i' uiriliter resumptum.

Retica ligna dicuntur quibus uites retinentur.

Rebulus est una de quinque speciebus mirobalanorum.

15. Regelatum plumbum liquatum.

Remorbescere est in morbum recidere.

Redimie dicuntur res que a predonibus redimuntur.

Repetundarum iudicio accusatur qui pecunias a sociis cepit. In hoc iudicio reus si ante moriatur in bona eius iudicium redit. unde et bona eius olim reça bona dicebantur quasi rei bona.

Remora dicitur a remorando sicut mora a morando. unde lucilius que nam uox ex te resonans meo gradui remoram facit? Remiligo similiter dicitur mora. hec remiligo huius remiliginis.

(220) Heant. III 1, 1. Cesso pultare ostium Vicini?

(223) Juv. X 223.

(19) Paulus, p. 276 M. For *exte* Lachm. conj. *extemplo*. Perhaps *ex aede*.



20. Reapse hoc est reipsa  
Vnde Pacuvius si non est in-  
gratum reapse quod fecit.

Reclaudio et recludo idem.  
Recludere est uel clausum ape-  
rire uel apertum claudere.

Retilat aperit reuelat.

Reueracit reuehit.

Regiescit crescit.

25. Reluere est soluere re-  
pignerare hoc est pignus reci-  
pere.

Recensio (i *fainf*) recensio  
antiqui dicebant a quo recens-  
itum recensitu producit penulti-  
mam. Prudentius stirpe recen-  
sita numerandus sanguinis heres  
Nunc autem dicimus recenseo  
es recensum su uel recensitum  
tu correpta penultima.

Redostire gratiam reddere et  
quasi beneficium beneficio ade-  
quare. ostire enim equare est.

Reprocare est ultro citroque  
importune poscere.

Recrastinare de die in diem  
prolongare.

30. Ricinium est quoddam  
matronale operimentum ideo sic  
uocatum quod dimidia eius pars  
retro reiciatur quod uulgo mavor-  
tem dicunt uel ut alii pronun-  
tiant mafortem. Ricinium quo-

que uocatur omne uestimentum  
quadratum Vnde et riciniati di-  
cuntur mimi.

Rica palliolum capitis i' par-  
uum ricinium Inde rica(? u)la i'  
mitra capitis uirginalis.

Risce dicuntur fenestre pari-  
etis.

Riscus cumera corticea siue  
uas viminibus contextum.

Ritus est consuetudo a maior-  
ibus tradita, ritus sequella ex-  
emplum.

35. Romipeta Romam petens.

Rorsus insensatus.

Rosata dicitur uestis coccinea  
i' rubea quia in bello quondam  
tunicatus erat ordo equestris ut  
sanguinis fluxum color similis  
celaret.

Rocus dicitur qui in ludo  
scacorum habetur.

Rotabulum dicitur ciueria (?)  
siue rutabulum a promendo  
stercora siue carbones in clibano  
ad coquendos panes.

40. Rumigerulus dicitur ad-  
rumator qui rumores apportat.  
Inde rumigeror aris et rumito  
tas. Vnde Neuius Simul alius alii  
rumitant inter se.

Rurigignentia rure nascentia.

Ruba sorbiciuncula.

(20) Paul., p. 279, where MSS have *feci*.

(24) Paul., p. 279, where MSS give Regiescit as our Glossary.

(26) Prudent. Apoth. 1001.

(30) Paul., p. 276, where see also for *Rica*.

(40) Paulus 271. Rumitant rumigerantur. Naeuius Simul alius aliunde  
rumitant inter sese. Here our Glossary is nearer the original article of Festus  
than Paulus; it is easy to see that the verse was a Saturnian and ended with  
*intérse*.

Rubea maior genus est portionis Rubea trociscata hoc est in troscos (l. trocos) redacta et rotundata.

Rubigo dicitur scabies ferri et dicitur rubigo quasi rodigo Rubigo quoque dicitur invidia malicia mentem unde nascitur corrumpens. rubigo etiam dicitur in agris quando in magno colore (l. calore) pluua modica ueniens spicas multas quas tetigit rubeas facit atque inanes.

45. Rupea ex utraque parte cauata.

Rumen pars gutturis est proxima gurgulioni quo esca deuoratur unde et rumare antiqui dicebant quod nunc dicimus ruminare.

Rudos uocant artifices lapides contusos et calci admixtos quo-

rum reliquiae rudera uocantur. Ruder quando neutrum est lapis est impolitus hoc ruder huius ruderis. quando autem masculinum est hic ruder huius ruderis dicitur sarmentum ut puta de sepe de uinea unde rudero as aui et per compositionem erudero as quod est expugnare.

Rudentes sunt nauium funes a stridore uentorum dicti quod nomen feminine protulit plautus hanc quam trahis rudentem complico [cōplico].

49. Ruō ruis aliquando ponitur absolute ut Virgilius ruit omnis in urbem Pastorum numerus aliquando actiue ut idem Incubueri mari totumque a sedibus imis. Vna eurusque nothusque ruunt.

I have spoken at some length on the value of the Phillipps Glossary, especially in respect to Paulus Diaconus, in the Cambridge Journal of Philology XIV, pp. 81-7, and have given some other extracts from it in Vol. VIII, p. 71 sqq., and again pp. 122-4, of the same journal. From these extracts it will be seen that it contains fragments of Latin poetry as well as prose not known from any other source.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

(46) Paulus, p. 271. Rumen est pars colli qua esca deuoratur, unde rumare dicebatur quod nunc ruminare.

(48) Rud. IV 3, 1. Heus mane. GR. Quid maneam? TR. Dum hanc tibi quam trahis rudentem complico.

(49) Cf. another extract from the Phillipps Glossary: Recens aliquando ponitur pro recenter, nomen pro aduerbio. Virgilius Sole recens orto numerus ruit omnis in urbem Pastorum reboant saltus siluaeque cicadis. Is this the Virgilius Maro of the Hesperica femina? See Archiv 1885, p. 260 sqq.; and see the excerpt given under *Nux* in Vol. VI, p. 460 of this Journal.

### III.—CHRONOLOGY OF THE ΠΕΝΤΗΚΟΝΤΑΕΤΙΑ.<sup>1</sup>

Thucydides, in cc. 98-117 of the First Book, gives an account of the chief events which took place in Greek history during the πεντηκονταετία, or about 50 years' time between the assumption of the ἡγεμονία by the Athenians and the occurrences connected with Corcyra and Potidaea, which were the ostensible causes of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war. He tells us he is led to make this digression or ἐκβολὴ τοῦ λόγου because most writers who preceded him had omitted this period entirely, confining themselves to the Persian war, or the events antecedent to it; while Hellanicus, who did touch upon it in his Ἀρχαί or Ἀττικὴ ἐνυγγραφή, narrated the occurrences briefly and inaccurately in respect of dates, βραχείως τε καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς. This rebuke may probably have been deserved; though we are able to see, from the allusions Thucydides makes to Herodotus, that he was a very exacting critic of the performances of others. In regard to one of the points, indeed, of his indictment of Herodotus, Cobet goes so far as to assert that Thucydides did not understand what Herodotus really meant to say. However this may be, it must be confessed that Thucydides himself has not succeeded in narrating the events he records with so much clearness as to preclude grave differences of opinion on the part of his modern interpreters in regard to some particulars. He employs such phrases as μετὰ ταῦτα, χρόνῳ ὕστερον, etc., very seldom giving a precise interval; and accordingly, though there is a substantial agreement between Clinton, Grote, Curtius, Peter, and Duncker, Krüger, who in his Historisch-Philologische Studien examined

<sup>1</sup>Among the papers of the late Professor C. D. MORRIS was found the MS of his discussion of Krüger's Chronology of the Πεντηκονταετία. This paper was read before the Johns Hopkins Philological Association at their meeting Nov. 6, 1885, and a summary of it was published in the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, No. 45. It was the intention of Professor MORRIS to print the paper in full as a vindication of the chronology which he follows in his edition of the First Book of Thucydides, and although the essay cannot have the benefit of his revising hand, it has seemed, both to the senior editor of the series, Professor JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, and to the editor of the Journal, that Professor Morris's views should be presented to the philological public, to whose judgment the thoughtful and careful scholar had made this appeal.—  
B. L. G.

that period with great minuteness, reached results very different from those which appear in what we may call the accepted chronology. Krüger's system was examined and rejected by Arnold Schäfer, in a book I have not seen; and as Schäfer's results do not in general differ in any conspicuous degree from those adopted by the historians, it might seem justifiable to neglect Krüger's arguments as having failed to commend themselves to the most competent judges. But Classen tells us that, as an editor of Thucydides, he has found himself constrained to accept Krüger's arrangement of the chronology of this period; influenced by a reply made to Schäfer by Krüger in his *Kritische Analekten*, the tone and temper, indeed, of which Classen can by no means approve, though he finds the answer sufficient. Now, though I could not procure either Schäfer's criticism or Krüger's reply to it, it seemed necessary for me to examine the grounds on which Krüger diverged so considerably from the arrangement adopted by others, since I was obliged either to accept or to repudiate the dates adopted by Classen. Those grounds are stated by Krüger with great fulness of detail in his *Historisch-Philologische Studien*; and it is not likely that anything of great weight can have been added in his later book. It will not be possible in this paper to go over the whole ground; but I think it can be shown within the limits of such a paper as this that Krüger's reasons for abandoning the received dates are of no great cogency. I propose, therefore, to examine them in regard to one event, the determination of the date of which carries with it the settlement of several other points in the chronology. This event is the flight of Themistocles to Asia, and his reception by the Persian king. Thucydides, I 137, tells us that Themistocles, finding himself compelled to leave the court of Admetus, was conveyed by him to Pydna. There he took passage for Ionia in a merchant vessel, but was driven by a storm out of his course, so that he narrowly escaped falling into the hands of the Athenians who were engaged in the siege of Naxos. At last he reached Ephesus in safety, and thence wrote a letter to Artaxerxes, the son of Xerxes, who had recently ascended the throne, *νεωστὶ βασιλεύοντα*. Now, we learn from Thuc. IV 50 that Artaxerxes died in the winter months of Ol. 88.4, *i. e.* B. C. 425-4. In this Thucydides coincides with Diod. XII 64, who mentions the death of Artaxerxes as occurring in the Archonship of Stratocles; and says that he had been on the throne for 40 years. This last statement Diod. makes also in XI 69, where he says that Xerxes



died after a reign of over 20 years, *ἐτη πλείω τῶν εἴκοσι*, and that Artaxerxes succeeded him and reigned 40 years. If these statements be accepted—and it is on them that the received chronology is based—Artaxerxes must have succeeded Xerxes in 465 or the beginning of 464; and the siege of Naxos and the flight of Themistocles must have been nearly coincident with this in time. I leave out of sight Clinton's calculation of the precise months. We reach the same result for the beginning of Artaxerxes' reign if we go in the opposite direction. The accession of Darius is well determined to have taken place in 521, and his reign to have lasted 36 years. This will place his death in 485. If, then, Xerxes reigned for 20 years, he must have died in 465, as before said. Plutarch, Them. 27, says, indeed, that Themistocles, according to Thucydides and Charon of Lampsacus, had his interview with Artaxerxes, but that Ephorus, Dinon, Clitarchus, Heraclides, and several more, *ἐτι δ' ἄλλοι πλείονες*, maintain that he met Xerxes himself. Plutarch himself thinks that the account of Thucydides is to be preferred, though there is some uncertainty, *τοῖς δὲ χρονικοῖς δοκεῖ μᾶλλον ὁ Θουκυδίδης συμφέρεσθαι, καίπερ οὐδ' αὐτοῖς ἀτρέμα συντεταγμένοις*. This slight variation in the accounts, which is paralleled by the statement in some of the authorities that Xerxes reigned 21 years and not 20 only, is explained by Clinton, after Dodwell, by the assumption that the seven months during which Artabanus, the assassin of Xerxes, maintained himself were by some added to the last year of the reign of Xerxes, and by others included in the first year of the reign of Artaxerxes. Whether this be the true account of the matter or not, the discrepancy is slight and would introduce no disorder into the chronology of Thucydides, for the sake of which only it is here referred to. All the above dates are confirmed by the Eusebian canon. But Krüger places the siege of Naxos and the coincident flight of Themistocles eight years earlier, that is, in 473; and we have now to see what are the grounds which have induced him to vary so considerably from the chronology accepted, to all appearance unanimously by all other authorities, and based upon statements so direct and positive. It is not an easy matter to present his arguments in a lucid and consecutive way. His reasoning is, as it seems to me, on several occasions of an eminently circular character; and I fear I shall hardly succeed in placing it clearly before you. It must be admitted, I think, that what we may call the *prima facie* aspect of the time of these occurrences is unusually distinct; and if it is

to be upset, it ought to be done by the help of statements equally precise and authoritative, and not by doubtful inferences from remarks of a vague and incidental character.

Krüger begins by admitting the probability that Thucydides was right in asserting that it was Artaxerxes and not Xerxes whom Themistocles found on the throne. But that Artaxerxes ascended the throne in 465, as Diodorus asserts, is, he says, an error of that very fallible writer. For we learn from Pausanias I 8, 2, καὶ Καλλίας, ὃς πρὸς Ἀρταξέρξην τὸν Ξέρξου τοῖς Ἕλλησι, ὡς Ἀθηναίων οἱ πολλοὶ λέγουσιν, ἐπραξε, where he mentions a monument in honor of Callias, who negotiated the so-called Cimonian peace between the Greeks and Persia, that the peace was made with Artaxerxes; and as this peace was, as we are compelled by the overwhelming preponderance of authority to assume, an immediate consequence of the battles of the Eurymedon, which Kr. dates in 469, it is clear that Artaxerxes must have ascended the throne before that time.

Now, upon this it may be remarked, first, that Thucydides places the Eurymedon battle after the reduction of Naxos (ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἡ ἐπ' Εὐρυμέδοντι ποταμῷ πεζομαχία καὶ ναυμαχία), and Krüger in no case doubts the order of the events reported by Thucydides; but he has not yet attempted to show that the Eurymedon affair took place in 469, and not, as all the other chronologers represent, at the end of 466 or beginning of 465; second, that Krüger himself argues later, at great length, that the so-called Cimonian peace, or the peace of Callias, had no existence at all except in the servid and patriotic imaginations of the orators; thirdly, that those who, like Grote and Curtius, believe in the existence of the treaty, agree in connecting it not with the battle of Eurymedon, but with the results of Cimon's victories at Cyprus in 449, as Diodorus represents it. I do not, of course, mean to imply that there are no difficulties connected with the treaty in question, the chief of them being the fact that Thucydides makes no mention of it. But plausible reasons for his silence about it are offered by the historians; and if, as is generally assumed, in accordance with Diod. II 4, the negotiation of it was the business which took Callias and other Athenian ambassadors to Susa, as Herodotus reports (VII 151), it is much more likely to have been connected with the successes near Cyprus in 449 than with the Eurymedon battle; since Herod. says the event he speaks of took place (πολλοῖσι ἔτεσι ὕστερον) many years after the battle of Salamis, which accords much better with the later than with the earlier date.

Krüger next proceeds to confirm his previous argument by attempting to ascertain approximately the birth-year of Themistocles. He accepts from Plutarch the statement that at his death he was 65 years old. But instead of agreeing with Plutarch in the same chapter that his death was directly connected with the successes of Cimon in 449, he passes at once to a story in Aelian, in his *ποικίλη ἱστορία*, that Themistocles was returning from school one day, and, meeting Pisistratus, was directed by his *παιδαγωγός* to make way for the despot to pass; but he answered *πάνν ἐλευθερίως*, "Hasn't he got room enough?"<sup>1</sup> If we assume, says Krüger, that this took place in the last year of the tyrant, B. C. 529 (rather 527) and that Themistocles was then six years old, he must have been born in B. C. 535, and then his death would have occurred in 470 (468). He then notices the opposing statement of Plutarch<sup>2</sup> which I have just mentioned, and also that the same biographer asserts that at the battle of Marathon (490) Themistocles was young; and also that Justin says that at that battle *Themistoclis adolescentis gloria emicuit*. He refers, however, to his essay on the life of Xenophon for the proof that an age of 45 years is in no way inconsistent with the character of *νεότης*, saying that we might be inclined to gather from these expressions that he was 25 or 26 years old at that battle, if there were not so many and so weighty reasons opposed to such a conclusion. The first of these that he mentions is that we are told that Themistocles and Aristides were brought up together by the same instructor; but we learn from Plutarch that Aristides was one of the most influential generals at Marathon, and he could certainly not have held such a command at the age of 25 or 26 in the good old times, but must have been a man of mature years; and so, accordingly, must Themistocles.

We must, of course, admit this with regard to Aristides, who, moreover, is said by Plutarch<sup>3</sup> to have been a friend (*εἰραῖρος*) of Cleisthenes, the legislator of 510. But of what value is the story which connects Themistocles with him in this way? It is mentioned, indeed, by Plutarch in his life of Aristides, but only as one of the explanations offered for the constant political rivalry between him and Themistocles; some people say, he says, *ἔτιοι μὲν φασιν*, that they were boys and brought up together, and from their infancy were always at variance with each other in all their words and actions, as well serious as playful. And then he goes on to say that another authority, whom he names Ariston of Ceos, says that the first

<sup>1</sup> αὐτὴ γάρ, εἶπεν, αὐτῷ οὐχ ἱκανὴ ὁδός;

<sup>2</sup> Them. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Aristid. 3.



origin of their enmity was a love-affair. In his life of Themistocles he mentions the latter story on the authority of the same writer; but he evidently lays more stress on fundamental differences in temperament between the two men as the ground of their political hostility. Aelian also, in one of the isolated anecdotes of his *Varia Historia*,<sup>1</sup> says that Aristides and Themistocles had the same guardians, and consequently were brought up by the same teacher; and were, notwithstanding, in continual rivalry all their lives. Aelian's authority may probably be the same as the unnamed writer from whom Plutarch took his account; but it is evident that he conceived the causal relation differently; and what is said about the parentage of the two men renders it quite unlikely that they would have been controlled by the same guardians.

Krüger goes on to say that a few years later than the battle of Marathon we find Themistocles possessed of great popular influence, and able to induce the people to spend on the construction of a fleet the proceeds of the mines at Laurium, instead of dividing the money among the citizens, as heretofore. This is true; but at the time Krüger himself assumes this advice to have been given, Themistocles would have been thirty years old, on the basis of Plutarch's statement as to his age and the time of his death; and there is no improbability that at that age a person of such force and talent as Themistocles is described as possessing would have already secured a preponderating influence.

The only other argument adduced by Krüger is that a certain Iunkos, of whom nothing is known except that he wrote a book on old age, from which Stobaeus makes extracts, said that the Athenians chose Themistocles general in the Persian war when he was *πλησίον τοῦ γήρως*. This must go for what it is worth. Anybody who chooses may believe that, on this authority, Themistocles was verging on old age when he manifested the vigor and resource which won the battle of Salamis.

Having thus proved that Themistocles must have been born as early as 535, and was consequently 55 at the battle of Salamis, Krüger infers that Plutarch was in error in connecting his death, at 65 years old, with Cimon's operations off Cyprus in 449, and that his mistake was in all likelihood caused by his confusing these operations with the earlier land and sea victories at the mouth of the Eurymedon. Krüger insists again that Thucydides' representation must be accepted which makes the flight of Themis-

<sup>1</sup> XIII 44.



toles coincident with the siege of Naxos, and both anterior to the Eurymedon battles, as if there were any dispute as to the order of these events. He refers to the narrative in Diodorus' as confirming this order, but says that Diod. is in error in compressing all the last fortunes of Themistocles into a single year, B. C. 471. This is a misrepresentation of Diod. in more than one respect: (1) Diodorus mentions under this year the ostracism of Themistocles, which was followed by his residence at Argos, his flight to Corcyra and thence to Admetus, of the duration of which events no indications are given; (2) he makes no allusion at all to the siege of Naxos, the whole of this part of the story being summed up in the words *κατήγγησεν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν*; (3) he devotes six chapters to his whole account, and apologizes at the end for the digression, *καὶ καὶ πεπλεονάκαμεν παρεκβάττες*, on the score of the great fame Themistocles had deservedly acquired. I cannot see how any "unbefangene Leser" could peruse these chapters and conceive that Diodorus intended to represent anything as occurring in 471 except the ostracism of Themistocles.

Another argument which Krüger adduces in proof of his contention that Themistocles died in 471 is as follows: In De Am. 42 Cicero says, *Themistocles, cum propter invidiam in exilium missus esset, ingratae patriae iniuriam non tulit, quam ferre debuit; fecit idem quod viginti annis ante apud nos fecerat Coriolanus*. Now, as Coriolanus was banished from Rome in 491, Themistocles must have been so in 471. This notice is probably trustworthy, since it is likely that Cicero was indebted for it to the *Liber Annalis* of Atticus, who, we know from Cicero<sup>2</sup> and Nepos, had taken great pains in reducing to chronological order the events of Roman history as well as notices *imperiosorum populorum et regum illustrium*. But, assuming its entire accuracy, it tells us nothing more than that Themistocles, when he was banished, followed the example of Coriolanus, twenty years earlier, in going to reside in a foreign city (Argos) which was, if not an active enemy of his own country, at least on good terms with the recently defeated Persians; and so far, therefore, it agrees with Diodorus, who also places the banishment of Themistocles in 471. If we suppose Cicero to be referring to the time of his flight from Argos to Corcyra, when pursued by the emissaries of Athens and Sparta, there is no parallel between his case and that of Coriolanus; nor can the parallel be found in their respective deaths; for Corio-

<sup>1</sup> XI 54-59.<sup>2</sup> Orat. §120; Brut. §42.

lanus died, as Kr. says, in 488, and he endeavors to show that Themistocles died in 471 or shortly after. If, again, the parallel is to be found in the flight of Them. to Persia, then, as his banishment, even according to Kr., took place two or three years earlier, the case of Coriolanus remains quite dissimilar.

There is yet another way in which Krüger seeks to show that Themistocles' flight must have taken place at about the time he has fixed for it. The order of the events as recorded by Thucydides being taken as unquestionable, and this giving us (1) the capture of Eion, (2) the conquest of Scyros, (3) the reduction of Naxos, and (4) the battle of Eurymedon, if it can be shown that the battle of Eurymedon took place in 470 or 469, Themistocles' flight, being coincident with the siege of Naxos, must be put as early as 472 or 471. And we now get what is to fix the date of Eurymedon for us, though that date has been assumed as known and certain, to lend additional probability to the inferences touching Themistocles. We find in Plutarch, Thes. 36, that in the Archonship of Phaëdon, B. C. 476, the Athenians were bidden by the Delphian oracle to bring to Attica the bones of Theseus, which were buried in some unknown spot in the island of Scyros, and that Cimon, after taking the island, discovered the sepulchre by the miraculous agency of an eagle and brought the bones to Athens. But in the Life of Cim. 8 we read that Cimon drove out the Dolopian inhabitants of Scyros on account of their piratical practices; and that he made a search for the grave of Theseus, and at last discovered it. Then he transported the bones to Athens with much ceremony; and on that occasion he and his fellow-generals, entering the theatre of Dionysus, were constrained by the Archon Apsephion (B. C. 469) to act as judges in the dramatic contest between Aeschylus and Sophocles, in which Sophocles was awarded the prize. Now, these two passages are in evident need of reconciliation. In the former passage we have the oracular order and apparently the fulfilment of it placed in 476; in the latter we have no mention, indeed, of the oracle, but the recovery of the bones placed in 469. Bentley, Phal. p. 301, argues that in the former passage *Φαίδων* is a false reading for *Ἀψεφίων*. To which Kr. objects that this would place the taking of Scyros after the battle of Eurymedon, contrary to the order of Thucydides. This is true if Kr.'s date for the battle of Eurymedon is assumed, but this has not yet been independently established. Clinton thinks there is no need of any change, but that the accounts

may be harmonized by assuming that the island was reduced in 476, though the oracle was not given till 469, when Kimon made a special expedition for the purpose of recovering the bones; and that Plutarch by mistake has, in his life of Theseus, transferred what really took place in 469 to the year of the original conquest of the island. Grote, V 413, accepts the statements as we find them; assuming that the oracle was given in 476, and that the Athenians attempted to fulfil it; but the unsocial manners of the Dolopians prevented any effectual search till Cimon had taken the island in 469, when he found, or pretended to find, the body. This account appears to me the most probable. It so happens that Diodorus, in his account of these events, is in serious confusion, placing the siege of Eion and the subsequent capture of Scyros, as well as the battle of Eurymedon, in 470, under the Archon Demotion; while he makes the successor of Demotion to be Phaeon or Phaeton, instead of Apsephion. I do not find Krüger's reconciliation of all these perplexities at all lucid; but this seems to be the result: The conquest of Scyros and the removal of the bones of Theseus to Athens occurred under the Archon Phaeton in 476; and the victory, in consequence of which Cimon and his fellow-commanders received the singular honor of serving as judges in the tragic contest between Sophocles and Aeschylus, was not the successful recovery of Theseus' bones, but the victory of Eurymedon, which must, therefore, have taken place at least as early as the Archonship of Apsephion, Ol. 77.4 = B. C. 469-8, under which we know, from the *διδασκαλίαι*, that this tragic contest took place. So here we have another proof that the siege of Naxos, preceding the battle of Eurymedon, must be placed some time before 470 or 471. Krüger argues at a later page (52), on the basis of this consideration, that the Eurymedon battle must have taken place in the spring of Ol. 77.3 = say March, B. C. 469, since, he says, in this way we get the return of the generals sufficiently near to the time at which Sophocles gained the prize to allow us to receive without question the statement that Apsephion prevailed upon the generals to act as judges in that contest. But Krüger strangely does not seem to have noticed that since Apsephion was Archon in Ol. 77.4 = 469-8, though he would have entered on his office in July, 469, the Dionysiac festival, over which he presided, must have taken place in Elaphebolion = March, 468; and thus the victory would have occurred nearly or quite a year before the time at which this distinguished honor was,

according to him, paid to Cimon and his companions. Whether this interval is not so great as to discredit Krüger's whole assumption as to the connection of the victory of Sophocles with the Eurymedon battle, I leave to your judgment. But it cannot escape notice that the connection of the honor paid to Cimon and his fellow-commanders with the battle of Eurymedon is solely due to Krüger's imagination, and has not the slightest warrant in our authorities. In that age the recovery of the bones of the hero-patron of Athens must have seemed a service quite as conspicuous and as deserving of extraordinary honor as the winning of even so considerable a victory as that at the mouth of the Eurymedon. A little further on, p. 46, we read that the siege of Naxos has its date fixed to B. C. 473 by the fact that the flight of Themistocles to Asia was contemporaneous with it. This, however, is only another instance of the way in which he employs one fact, which itself sadly stands in need of support, to buttress another which has been itself previously employed as one of the elements in the foundation on which the supporting fact rests.

But the testimony of Thucydides, which Kr. accepts, assures us of the coincidence of two facts—the escape of Themistocles to Asia and the recent accession of Artaxerxes after the death of Xerxes; and it will be of little use to establish the probability that Themistocles crossed the Aegean in 473 or 472 if it remains certain that Artaxerxes did not succeed his father till 465. It is, therefore, indispensable for Krüger to upset the evidence on which other chronologers have founded their conclusion that Xerxes was assassinated and Artaxerxes came to the throne in 465 or 464. He begins his argument upon this point by admitting that all the writers who give us any precise chronological statements agree that Artaxerxes ascended the throne in Ol. 78.4 = B. C. 465-4; and in a note he tells us that a certain Herr Kleinert, who in the interest of Biblical chronology had opposed his views in one of the theological journals, adduced no less than thirty ancient testimonies in confirmation of the dates given by Diodorus. But, he says, this assumption is not only inconsistent with the fully trustworthy notices which have been adduced as to the time of the flight of Themistocles, but leads to conclusions which are in plain conflict with calculations that are perfectly certain and founded on evidence which cannot be assailed.<sup>1</sup> The first of these necessary

<sup>1</sup> Allein diese Annahme ist nicht nur mit den völlig zuverlässigen Nachrichten über die Zeit der Flucht des Themistokles unvereinbar, sondern sie



but inadmissible inferences has respect to the connection of the story of Pausanias with the flight of Themistocles, about which I will speak later. Next, he says it will follow that the Eurymedon battle must be placed later than 465, the improbability of which has been shown above, "beweist zur Genüge." I think it will be admitted that this is arguing in a circle. We are not helped at all, he says, by the assumption of an interregnum between the death of Xerxes and the accession of Artaxerxes. We must assume, he maintains, that Thucydides and Charon of Lampsacus, who, according to Plutarch, gave the same account, conceived the accession of Artaxerxes as occurring two Olympiads or eight years earlier; and the testimony of Charon must be regarded as most weighty, since he lived under Artaxerxes, and was, as an Asiatic, accustomed to base his calculations on the years of the Persian reigns; and Charon could not possibly have placed the accession of Artaxerxes in 465 if he had before him the story of Themistocles and Pausanias arranged even approximately as it is given by Thucydides and Diodorus. We may therefore assume that both Thucydides and Charon placed the accession of Artaxerxes in 473. We have, then, for this date "zwei vollwichtige Gewährsmänner"; and hereafter Krüger writes as if the testimony of Thucydides and Charon was distinctly in favor of the earlier date, and might be used, therefore, to controvert whatever opposing statements he finds elsewhere. He proceeds: "Plutarch says that the statement of Themistocles and Charon appears to him to harmonize better than that of the other authors he names with the chronological tables, though these are not quite precise; but this does not give us much additional certitude, since Plutarch, as has been mentioned, connected the death of Themistocles with Cimon's battles off Cyprus in 449, and may very well have supposed that statements which placed Artaxerxes' accession in 465 were in harmony with Thucydides." It will be observed how Krüger now takes it for a thing established that Thucydides recognized the year he has fixed upon as the date of that event. It is true, says Kr., that Diod. XI 69 gives the year 465, Ol. 78.4, for that of the accession of Artaxerxes, and it is well known that he largely follows Ephorus;<sup>1</sup> but though he praises that historian's arrangement of his material,

führt auch zu Folgerungen mit denen sehr sichere, auf nicht anzutastende Zeugnisse gegründete Berechnungen im offenbarsten Widerspruche stehn (p. 53).

<sup>1</sup>V 1, 4: "Εφορος τὰς κοινὰς πράξεις ἀναγράφων οὐ μόνον κατὰ τὴν λέξιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἐπιτέτευχε.

he does not specially commend his chronological exactness, and we are not justified in assuming that either in Ephorus or in any other of the historians named by Plutarch did Diodorus find the year 465 set down as that of Artaxerxes' accession. "If," he proceeds, "we may assume that these writers, as is indicated by the vague character of Plutarch's statement, gave their narrative of Themistocles' adventures without definition of years, it is very possible that their chronology agreed rather with the notice of Thucydides and Charon than with that of Diodorus." Here, again, it is assumed without shadow of proof that Thucydides is an authority for the earlier date, and also that Diodorus found no dates assigned in the writer he followed. If it were really the case, Kr. goes on to say, that Ephorus and the other authors referred to by Plutarch really made Artaxerxes succeed in 465, then we must attribute to Thucydides great carelessness of statement, and we shall be compelled to assign to the reign of Xerxes the Eurymedon battle and the so-called peace of Cimon. (This, be it observed, will be necessary only if we accept Krüger's dates for these events.) But if this were true, how can we account for the fact that Athenian orators did not insist on the circumstance that the *same* king had *twice* made enormous efforts to subdue Hellas and been twice foiled? It is true that Plutarch<sup>1</sup> represents the preparations made against Greece under the guidance of Themistocles to have taken place in the reign of Artaxerxes, and attributes the death of Themistocles to his despair of being able to fulfil his engagements to the king; and Thucydides<sup>2</sup> also mentions the same connection as assigned by some authorities. But it has been proved above that these events took place shortly before the battle of Eurymedon. And yet Plutarch asserts in the most distinct way that Themistocles lived long and peacefully in Asia, and that it was not till the interference of the Athenians in the revolt of Egypt, and the subsequent successes of Cimon off Cyprus, which Kr. himself dates in 449, that the king called upon him to fulfil his engagements and reduce Greece under the Persian power. Kr. concludes this part of his argument in these terms: "We find it the prevailing tradition that Themistocles died before Eurymedon and under Artaxerxes; and there is no trace of important deviation from this on the part of Ephorus, Dinon, Clitarchus, Heraclides; and, therefore, we may assume that these writers in regard to the time of Artaxerxes' accession varied only slightly, if at all, from the date

<sup>1</sup> Them. 31, Cim. 18.<sup>2</sup> I 138, 4.

to which Thucydides has led us; and certainly they cannot be quoted in support of the statement of Diodorus and the Canon that Artax. came to the throne in 465." Here, again, it will be seen that Kr. assumes that Thucydides is distinctly in favor of his determination; whereas it is upon the testimony of Thucydides chiefly that other chronologists have based the ordinarily accepted date. It will be remembered that we know no more of Charon's testimony than this—that, according to Plutarch, he agreed with Thucydides in making Artaxerxes the king at the time of Themistocles' arrival in Asia. But Kr. has by this time convinced himself that both Thucydides and Charon give distinctly the date which he has fixed upon for the accession of Artaxerxes. Even if we suppose, says Kr., that these late and derivative writers did support the date of Diodorus, how can we venture to set their authority against the opposing statement of Charon, an Asiatic, who lived under both Xerxes and Artaxerxes, and against that of Thucydides, who must have gained his information about Themistocles from members of his family, and who has manifested his scrupulous attention to accuracy by the doubtful way in which he has referred to the story of the mode of his death? The date of Xerxes' death (in 473) therefore is far the best established, and can only be upset by the most positive and cogent arguments. But no such arguments are forthcoming; and we have much else which can be regarded as confirmatory of the earlier date. One of these additional supports is as follows, and one "*von besonderm Gewicht*" (p. 59). Ctesias, if the extracts of Photius are to be trusted, was able to report only one tale of adultery as occurring in the Persian royal family after Xerxes' return from Greece. But certainly if Xerxes had lived till 465, he must have had to narrate several more of the same sort. It is true, he goes on to say, that Ctesias states that Artaxerxes reigned 42 years—agreeing, it will be observed, nearly with the 40 of Diodorus—and that this would place the death of Xerxes in Ol. 78.3 (B. C. 466), and so invalidate the inference he has just drawn; but it is hazardous to oppose mere numbers, which are often falsified, to reasons of another sort.

Krüger assumes now, in his manner, that Ctesias has told us that Xerxes reigned only a short time after his return from Greece; and thinks it worth while to cite other points of evidence to the same effect, though he admits that by themselves they would deserve little attention. It is not worth while to give these in detail; one, which he speaks of as "*erheblicher*," is this of Justin:

*Xerxes rex Persarum terror ante gentium, bello infeliciter gesto, etiam suis contemptui esse coepit*; and another is that Justin says Artaxerxes was *puer admodum* when Artabanus killed Xerxes, and this leads to a speculation as to the time at which Xerxes probably married Amestris, which it is not worth while for the present purpose to examine, though it gives Krüger another opportunity of assuming the irreconcilable discrepancy between Diodorus and the Eusebian Canon on the one side, and Thucydides and Charon on the other.

The contradiction, however, it is assumed, does exist; and it is probably due to a corruption in the numeral letters, as is unquestionably the case in many instances. We might assume in this particular case that a  $\Delta$  has been removed from the figures giving the reign of Artaxerxes and attached to that of Xerxes; but this would leave only eleven years for the reign of Xerxes, which is opposed to another statement. On the other hand, we may, with greater probability, suppose that the letters MI (in Diod. only M) or MII (Ctesias), which we find given for the length of Artaxerxes' reign, have been corrupted out of an original MH, or 48. If this number 48 was the original and correct one, then since Artaxerxes died in 425, his accession must have taken place in 473, the very year we have before fixed upon. This will, indeed, make the reign of Xerxes six or seven years shorter than is commonly assumed. But if we suppose that these figures were derived from Ctesias—and Ctesias, if we may trust the extracts made by Photius, gave no exact statement of the length of Xerxes' reign—then the years commonly assigned to him must have been arrived at by calculation, and so, naturally, the years were given to him which a false reading took away from the reign of Artaxerxes.

We have still to examine the connection between the fortunes of Themistocles and those of Pausanias. It was probably a desire to bring these into harmony that set Kr. originally at the task of determining the death of Xerxes eight years earlier than the commonly accepted date. It is most unfortunate that in narrating them Thucydides gives us not a single distinct intimation of the time at which any of them took place. We know only that Pausanias was sent out, probably in the spring of 477, in command of a fleet to the Asiatic coast. He reduced Cyprus, and then captured Byzantium. He seems to have passed a considerable time there, during which he manifested an intolerable arrogance and tyranny, and entered into communication with the Persian king



by the agency of the Eretrian Gongylus, dismissing without the consent of allies certain kinsmen of Xerxes who had been captured in Byzantium. In consequence of this evil report he was recalled to Sparta and put upon his trial; and though he was acquitted on the main charge of Medizing, he was not sent out again to exercise his command; but he made his way, οὐ κελευσάντων τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, to Byzantium again in a ship of Hormion, and resuming his former practices, was forced by the Athenians to leave that city. He then took up his abode at Colonae, in the Troad; and it was reported at Sparta that he was still carrying on his intercourse with the Persians and certainly doing no good there, καὶ οὐκ ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ τὴν μοῖρην ποιούμενος.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, he received a peremptory order to return with the messenger to Sparta; and wishing to avoid suspicion as far as possible, and trusting that by the help of money he would be able to extricate himself from any serious danger, he did not disobey this command. He was at first imprisoned by the Ephori, but succeeded after a time in being again set at large, ἔπειτα διαπραξάμενος ὕστερον ἐξῆλθε. The authorities at Sparta had by no means got rid of their suspicions, but they had secured no evidence of his treason sufficiently direct and convincing to justify them in proceeding summarily against him. There was no question, Thucydides assures us, that he was actually tampering with the Helots, holding out to them the bait of liberty and citizenship if they would aid him in carrying out his plans; and though some of the Helots informed the authorities of these intrigues, such was their slowness and reluctance to deal harshly with a man of the rank and dignity of Pausanias, that no final decision was taken till that Argilian slave to whom Pausanias had intrusted his last letter to Artabazus had given the Ephori the means of hearing his treasonable practices recounted by his own lips. Now, as I have said, in all this narrative there is not a single intimation of a date. It connects itself, however, directly with our main question—viz. the time of the escape of Themistocles to Asia, because we are told that the Spartans asserted that they had discovered that Themistocles was implicated in the treasonable designs of Pausanias; and that it was in consequence of these representations that Themistocles, who had been ostracized, and had lived at first at Argos, found himself compelled

<sup>1</sup> A. Pierson, Philol. XXVIII, p. 56, writes: τὴν μόνην ποιούμενος heisst nicht: er war vereinzelt, sondern er trennte sich vom allgemeinen griechischen Interesse und nahm seinen eigenen weg.

to flee, first to Corcyra, and then to the court of Admetos, and finally to make his escape to Asia. The ostracism of Themistocles is placed by Diodorus and the chronologers generally in 471.

I think, as I have intimated, that Krüger's reason for reconstructing the chronology of this period was his desire to harmonize these accounts. He found in Diodorus the whole narrative of the later fortunes of Pausanias placed under the year 477; and he seems to have convinced himself that in this and other similar cases Diodorus intended to represent all the events which he thus narrates under a single date as occurring in one year. In the same way Diodorus gives the whole story of Themistocles, beginning with his ostracism, under the year 471. It is clear, says Krüger, that these occurrences in the lives of the two men cannot have been separated by an interval of six years. They must in some way be approximated. Accordingly, he finds, by making a very modest estimate of the probable duration of the several stages in the downward career of Pausanias, that his death may be brought as low as 473. But, as he thinks he can get no lower, it is indispensable that the flight of Themistocles, which was certainly connected as a result with the fall of Pausanias, be carried backward some years above the date which the ordinary chronology fixes for it. There is no doubt that Krüger's assumed motive was a reasonable one. He should, however, have felt that the region in which he might safely stretch things somewhat was in the story of Pausanias, where we are left absolutely without guidance as to the details of time. The period he passed in intrigues at Colonaë may very likely have been longer, and that which was so spent after his second recall must almost certainly have been very much more extended than Krüger estimates. We are not told how many communications passed between him and the king through the intervention of Artabazus; but we may infer that there were several, from the words in which the Argilian informer is described, *ὁ μέλλων τὰς τελευταίας βασιλεῖ ἐπιστολὰς πρὸς Ἀρτάβαζον κομεῖν*, and from the terms in which the man reproaches Pausanias—that, though he had always been faithful *ἐν ταῖς πρὸς βασιλέα διακονίαις*, *προτιμηθεὶς ἐν ἴσῳ τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν διακόνων ἀποθανεῖν*. It may also be observed that there is not a word to show that the charge brought by the Lacedaemonians against Themistocles followed immediately upon the condemnation of Pausanias. We are told that after his ostracism Themistocles lived at Argos and visited other parts of the Peloponnesus, *ἔχων διαίταν μὲν ἐν Ἀργεῖ, ἐπιφοιτῶν δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν ἄλλην*

Πελοπόννησον; and it may very well have been the case that it was not until the Spartan authorities had discovered that these movements of Themistocles were dangerous to their supremacy that they decided to take active steps to have him put out of the way. There are indications in some casual notices in Herodotus (IX 35) that the Spartans had, in the two decades succeeding the Persian war, much trouble to secure their predominance in the Peloponnesus; and the readiness of the Helots to avail themselves of the confusion caused by the earthquake in 464 and rise against their masters, indicates that the treasonable promises of Pausanias may have had an enduring effect which the Spartan authorities may not unreasonably have judged might be dangerously fostered if Themistocles were permitted to continue the practice, which Thucydides says he adopted when residing in Argos, of making excursions into various parts of the Peloponnesus. It seems to me that it is in the fact that the connected stories of Pausanias and Themistocles, reported to us as they are without the slightest indication of the time during which each particular phase lasted, admit of indefinite stretching or expansion at the points I have indicated, that the real solution of the difficulty which Krüger felt is to be found. Since the greater part of this paper was written I have received Schäfer's criticism and Krüger's reply to it. I have just had time to read Schäfer's program, and to glance at Krüger's answer. I see that Schäfer, with the purpose no doubt of causing an approximation between the end of Pausanias and that of Themistocles, assumes that the capture of Eion, which Thucydides mentions as the first action of the Athenians in their Hegemony, did not take place till 469. This appears to me quite as improbable as is the scheme which he opposes. Krüger naturally fastens upon this as a supposition at once unwarranted and unlikely; though it is not, as he represents, the keystone of Schäfer's system, which cannot be touched without bringing the whole into confusion. I mention it only to show that the real difficulty in the situation lies in the connection of the two stories of Pausanias and Themistocles, and to insist once more that the only thing needed for bringing them into harmony is that we leave out of our calculation anything approaching a determination of the exact time consumed during the several stages of the narratives, seeing that all such calculations must be due solely to our own estimate of what is probable, and have not in any case an iota of evidence to rest upon. I have not been able to do more than glance at Krüger's reply to Schäfer. It

is characterized by a tone of great confidence and still greater acerbity; but I have not been able to discover that he has adduced any, even the smallest, additional evidence in support of his position. It is almost comical to see how he continues to pose as the defender of the authenticity of the statements of Thucydides which he assumes are the objects of attack on the part of his opponents. He says,<sup>1</sup> "Either the Canon and company"—meaning the crowd of witnesses adduced by Kleinert to confirm the statement of Diodorus that Artaxerxes reigned 40 years—"all of them witnesses of the second or third rank, are in error, or Thucydides has made a false statement as to the accession of Artaxerxes." And again: "I must again insist that a single witness like Thucydides, a contemporary, appears to me of unquestionably greater weight than all these thirty." This affectation of jealousy for the credit of Thucydides takes a comical aspect when we remember that Thucydides gives us the date of Artaxerxes' death only; that Diodorus and the despised thirty witnesses say he reigned for 40 years, which will put his accession at the end of 464; that Ctesias alone gives 42 years, which will fix his accession in 465; and that it is only Krüger himself who, by turning Ctesias' 42 into 48, thrusts it back to 473.

There is another matter—the revolt of the island of Thasos—the time of which is exactly defined by statements of Thucydides, and which, if admitted, will serve to keep the Asiatic voyage of Themistocles at the date usually assigned to it. I will not go into the particulars of this, but will just quote what Clinton says as to the way in which Krüger gets over it. It must be remembered that Krüger translated into Latin the second volume of Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, making corrections and other changes. Krüger says: "Neque vero Thucydidis rationes Clintoni computationi favere alio loco monstrabo." Clinton remarks: "At 465, where Thucydides is quoted, I find only this remark: 'Ex meis rationibus Thasii anno quadringentesimo sexagesimo septimo defecerunt: vide tabulas meas.' At 437, where I again treat the subject, the translator is silent."

There is one other point in Krüger's chronological system which has produced grave results, but which I can only just mention. It will be remembered that Thucydides finds fault with Hellanicus because he had treated of matters in his *Ἀρχαί, βραχέως τε καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς*. Krüger bases upon this one of his

<sup>1</sup> Krit. An. p. 28.



most vital principles. If Thucydides rebuked Hellanicus for inaccuracy in his chronology, it may be taken for granted that Thucydides imposed upon himself the rule of never stating any event or portion of an event out of its exact chronological order. In order to force the narrative to conform to this canon, he is compelled to alter in one chapter *δεκάτῃ* into *τετάρτῃ* in defiance of all MSS and of the evidence of Diodorus, making the so-called third Messenian war end in its fourth and not in its tenth year. In this, so far as I can see, he has been followed by no editor except Classen. In another case, c. 109, §2, where Krüger himself admits that a certain occurrence must have taken place probably a year before that which precedes it in the narrative, the difficulty is surmounted by insisting on the fact that that occurrence did not have its intended result. Only the failure of the attempt was of importance; and accordingly it is mentioned where this failure was operative—in causing the sending of a Persian army to drive the Athenians out of Egypt.

C. D. MORRIS.

#### IV.—THE AO NAGA LANGUAGE OF SOUTHERN ASSAM.

The numerous tribes of the widely-extended Naga people are distributed over the irregular ranges of mountains which lie south of the Brahmaputra valley. Roughly speaking, their country extends between  $93^{\circ}$  and  $97^{\circ}$  E. long. and between  $25^{\circ}$  and  $27^{\circ} 30'$  N. lat.

The Ao Nagas, whose language forms the subject of this paper, correspond to the Central Naga group in Capt. Damant's classification, and may be more exactly defined as lying on the southern edge of the Sibsagor District, having as their eastern boundary the western branch of the Dikho River, and thence following westward the curve of the hills to about  $26^{\circ} 20'$  N. lat.

The name Ao, by which they call themselves, will not be found on any of the older maps or in publications on the hill tribes of Assam, but, instead, are used certain Assamese designations—as Hatigorias, Dupdorias, Assiringias, and a few others—given them in the time of the old Assamese kings. They have more than forty villages, and their number is estimated at about one hundred thousand.

No grammar or considerable vocabulary of the Ao Naga has hitherto been published—a fact true, indeed, of the speech of all the Naga tribes, up to the present time.

The language of this tribe is spoken in two dialects, called, respectively, Zwingi or Zungi and Mungsen. Tradition relates, in explanation of these two varieties of their speech, that when the section of the tribe calling themselves Zwingi occupied only a single village, they conquered the neighboring village of the Mungsen, and that thenceforth the two became one people. Though both dialects are current in most Ao villages, the Zwingi is the dominant one, and the one represented in these pages.

None of the brief lists of words published in Mr. Hodgson's works, and purporting to represent Naga speech, exactly corresponds to the Zwingi Ao. What he calls "Khari Naga" is mainly the Mungsen dialect, and "Tengsa Naga" is a mixture of Ao and the language of the tribe lying next east.

It may be said, in passing, that these vocabularies were collected many years ago, before the relations of the tribes were well under-

stood, and from natives whose only mode of communication with their questioners was through imperfectly understood Assamese; hence confusion of dialects and other inaccuracies were almost sure to occur.

In Sir George Campbell's *Specimens of the Languages of India*, the dialect which he calls *Deka Haimong*, the Assamese name of a prominent village, appears to be identical with the Ao Naga, making some allowance for difference in mode of phonetic representation.

Probably no foreigner has a better acquaintance with the language of the Ao tribe than the Rev. E. W. Clark, who for ten years has resided among this people, in the service of the American Baptist Missionary Union. In the year 1879 there was obtained from Mr. Clark, and published in the *Jour. Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. XI, Part II, a brief vocabulary of what he called the *Zungī* or *Zwingī* dialect of Naga, which is clearly the language under consideration, though the spelling of words is, in some instances, not accordant with later usage. To the same missionary belongs the honor of reducing this language to writing, and translating into it portions of the Scriptures, thus bringing it within reach of scientific investigation.

In the year 1884 he printed at Molung, his mission station at that time among this people, *John's Gospel*, and the life of Joseph as contained in eleven chapters of *Genesis*. To these was added, in the following year, a revised edition of *Matthew's Gospel*, which had before been issued by the same press in a tentative form. It is from these considerable specimens, supplemented by the explanations which Mr. Clark has had the kindness to communicate to me privately, that I have been able to prepare this paper, which contains, so far as I can learn, the first extended and systematic account of the structure of the *Zwingi* Ao language that has anywhere been published.

#### I.—THE ALPHABET.

The number of characters which Mr. Clark uses, single or combined, to represent Ao sounds is twenty-nine. They are as follows:

Vowels, a, i, e, o, u, ă.	Labials, p, f, b, m.
Gutturals, k, q, g, ng.	Semivowels, y, r, l, v, w.
Palatals, ch, j.	Sibilants, s (c), sh, z.
Dentals, t, d, n.	Aspiration, h.

These letters all occur initially, except *ü* and *v*, which last letter seems scarcely to have a place in the language, being used mostly in transliterating Hebrew proper names, and occurring in only one Ao word, *ova*; but the sounds are of very different degrees of frequency at the beginning of syllables, the most frequent being *t*, *a*, *m*, *s*, *k*—and in this order. The least frequent, in order of infrequency, are *ng*, *g*, *w*, *h*, *q*, *d*, *u*, *e*, *j*. The final sounds of Ao words are, in a great majority of instances, vowels or nasals; and, among the latter, the guttural nasal is extremely common. The letters *k* and *r*, in this position, are not infrequent; but *t*, *p*, *b*—the only other finals noted in pure Ao words—are seldom heard. Other languages of the Tibeto-Burman group make restrictions as to initial or final letters; thus, in Garo, *k*, *ng*, *t*, *p*, *y*, *l* never occur as initials; the Lepcha allows as finals the vowels and *k*, *ng*, *t*, *n*, *b* or *p*, *m*, *r*, *l* only, but does not object to any of its sounds at the beginning of syllables; the Tibetan permits at the end of syllables, besides vowels, the consonants *g*, *ng*, *d*, *n*, *b*, *m*, *r*, *l*, *s*.

The vowels in Mr. Clark's scheme have in general the Italian sound, and, except the so-called long and short *u*, are not marked for quantity. The vowel *a* is heard as in 'ah'; *i* as in 'pin,' 'pique'; *e* as in 'met,' 'they'; *o* as in 'not,' 'note'; *u* as in 'boot'; *ü* as in 'but.' For the last character, which I employ for convenience in printing, Mr. Clark uses a looped *v*. This sound is very common in the language.

Of the pronunciation of the consonants, it is only necessary to remark that *ch* is heard as in 'church'; *g* as in 'go'; and that *c*, which occurs only after *s*, is used to "prolong and slightly aspirate" that letter. It may be noted that *c* has the sound of *s* in Assamese, which may have determined its use here. Certain of the mutes are used interchangeably, according to taste or euphony, as *t*, *d*; *p*, *b*; *g*, *k*.

A prominent feature of Ao phonetics is the absence of the aspirate mutes, which occur more or less in the Sanskritic languages of India. Not only are the sonant aspirates wanting—a characteristic of the Tibeto-Burman group in general—but the surd aspirates are wanting as well; thus, one finds *Rut* for *Ruth*, *Betlehem* for *Bethlehem*, etc.

## II.—NOUNS.

(a) *Gender*. The distinction of gender is made only where the quality of sex actually exists, and is indicated in one of three



ways: firstly, and most commonly, by special sexual names, as *tebu* or *bu* 'father,' *tetzü* or *tzü* 'mother,' *taei* 'boar,' *tin* 'sow'; secondly, by added words for 'male' or 'female,' which differ somewhat according to the class of beings spoken of; thus, *tebur* (*bur*) and *tetzür* (*tzür*) are 'male' and 'female,' respectively, of human beings; and *tebong* (*bong*) and *tetzür* (*tzür*), of the lower animals; e. g. *nabong* 'goat' in general, *nabong tebong* 'he-goat,' *nabong tetzür* 'she-goat'; thirdly, by suffixes, *ba* for masculine and *la* for feminine; e. g. *alar* 'servant' in general, but *alarla* 'maid-servant.' These suffixes, however, are not in common use as indicative of gender.

The words *ginungpo* (for *kinungpo*) 'husband,' and *ginungtzü* (for *kinungtzü*) 'wife,' seem to illustrate how a syllable originally a noun may become virtually a gender-forming suffix. These words are compounded of *ki* 'house,' *nung*—perhaps for the longer *nunger* 'one who is in,' from the postposition *nung* 'in'—and *po*, an old word for 'man,' and *tzü* 'woman.' They mean, therefore, respectively, 'house-in-man' and 'house-in-woman'; or, as we often say, 'the man of the house,' 'the woman of the house.'

Many names of animate beings, as in other languages, convey in themselves no distinction of gender; e. g. *chir* 'child,' *tanur* 'boy' or 'girl,' *ak* 'swine.'

(b) *Number*. It is a rule of the language that number is not indicated by any special sign when the context renders this unnecessary; otherwise, a plural suffix is used, or one of several nouns of multitude serves as a substitute. The suffix is *tüm*, which is used more often in books than in ordinary conversation; e. g. *chir* 'child,' *chirtüm* 'children.' The more common nouns used for the same purpose are: *telok* or *lok*; *terong* or *rong*; *arogo*, shortened to *rogo*. The first means properly 'flock'; in a slightly different form it enters into the plural of the personal pronouns; e. g. *nenok* 'the flock of you.' The second means 'a clump,' as of bushes, and is commonly used when the postposition *nung* follows. The third corresponds most nearly to the English 'mess,' as the following interesting explanation by Mr. Clark shows. When the Ao Nagas start out on the war-path, one person carries for three or four others a basket of provisions. This is called *arür-ku*. In course of time the name of this essential part of the *impedimenta* was transferred to the group of persons dependent upon it; it was next contracted to *arogo*, and finally to *rogo*.

A rudimentary dual number is perhaps seen in such expressions

as *tebur aser tetzürna*, lit. 'male and female-two,' *Andria aser Filipna* 'Andrew and Philip-two.' Here *na* is for *ana*, the numeral 'two.'

(c) *Case-Relations*. It is hardly correct to speak of declension in Ao Naga, using that term in the sense which it has in the inflecting languages.

Though there appears some tendency to case-formation, the relations of nouns and pronouns to other members of the sentence are ordinarily expressed by position, or by words used like prepositions, but always placed after the word governed. Though, on a plan like this, the number of "cases" is limited only by the different relations expressed, the following table of the more frequent combinations will serve to illustrate the subject. We take the word *tebu*, which also has the form *bu* 'father.'

SING.		
Nom.	<i>tebu(e)</i>	'a father.'
Acc.	<i>tebu dak</i> or <i>dang</i>	'a father.'
Inst.	<i>tebu age</i>	'by a father.'
Dat.	<i>tebu dange</i>	'to a father.'
Abl.	<i>tebu nunge</i>	'from a father.'
Gen.	<i>tebu</i>	'of a father.'
Loc.	<i>tebu nung</i>	'in a father.'
Voc.	<i>ina</i> or <i>O tebu</i>	'O father.'
PLUR.		
Nom.	<i>tebutüm(e)</i>	'fathers.'
Acc.	<i>tebutüm dak</i> or <i>dang</i>	'fathers.'
Inst.	<i>tebutüm age</i>	'by fathers.'

This scheme must be taken as a rather rough survey of the manner in which the relations of case are expressed, since not only are the postpositions not restricted to the meanings given above, but they, to some extent, interchange in office according to the words with which they happen to be used in the sentence.

The suffix *e*, which appears with the nominative, is not a constant sign of that case, but is used only when the relation might be confused with that of other words in the sentence. The same letter is appended to a noun or verb in a variety of other uses: 1. It denotes the place in which motion ends; e. g. *kotak ime matutsü* 'shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven,' *Yirusaleme tonga ashi* 'having come to Jerusalem, said'; 2. By a somewhat similar use it forms a substitute for a purpose-clause, when added

to a verb-root; e. g. *ozoe pa külume aru* 'we have come to worship him,' for which *külümtsü* or *tekülümtsü* is the ordinary expression—as will be noted hereafter; 3. It expresses manner of acting; e. g. *Yohan meziunge mezüme aru* 'John came neither eating nor drinking'; 4. It denotes cause; e. g. *nenok Tebue meshilete* 'because your Father knoweth not.' It is possible that these verbal forms in *e* are corruptions of the participle in *a*, and the last example should be read 'your Father knowing not.' The relation of direct object, if sufficiently indicated by the context, may dispense with the postposition. The relation of possessor—which we have called genitive—is expressed solely by position before the governing noun. The other relations which are grouped under the genitive in the classic languages are otherwise expressed in Ao. The vocative is simply the root-word preceded by either of the interjections *ina* or *O*.

In case the noun is modified by a following adjective or pronoun, the postposition is placed after the latter; or, as one is accustomed to say in regard to some other languages of this group, the adjective or pronoun is inflected instead of the noun.

(d) *Structural Character.* There is no complete formal distinction between nouns, adjectives and verbs. Each in its root-form is indistinguishable from the others; and even the suffixes of derivation, which nouns often assume, are in great part common to all three. Thus, the suffix *er* forms the present indicative of verbs, verbal adjectives or participles, and nouns; e. g. the root *zilu* 'write,' taking on *er*, forms by contraction *zilur*, which means 'I,' etc., 'write,' 'writing,' or 'writer,' according to the connection.

Nouns are formed with great facility from other parts of speech; e. g. from the postposition *nung* 'in' is formed the noun *nungür* (better *nunger*), which means 'one who is in,' 'inhabitant.' Both nouns and adjectives very often take a prefix, which has the form *te* before consonants and *l'* before vowels. With these parts of speech it appears to have no formative significance, but is rather intensive in character, and may be assumed or thrown off at pleasure; thus, one may say *tebu* or *bu*, *tetzür* or *tzür*, *tazung* or *azung*. The same prefix, apparently, is used with the prohibitive imperative of the verb, where it virtually has a formative value, whatever may have been its original force.

## III.—ADJECTIVES.

(a) *Formation.* These have no declension, except in the sense referred to above. As already noted, the naked root may be used in an adjective sense; but many adjectively-used words add a suffix to the root. The most common suffix is *ba*, said to be a slightly altered form of *pa*, the third personal pronoun.

This suffix has a prevailingly relative sense, and stands in situations where we ordinarily employ a relative clause. Examples of its various uses are: In a transitive sense, *tanür tefsetsü bushiba sügo* '(he) who sought (*bushiba*) to slay the boy has died'; in an intransitive sense, *Yihuda tsuba asoba kong ali* 'where is (he) who is born (*asoba*) king of the Jews?'; in a passive sense, *Isaya ainkar age zumbiba olsü* 'the word spoken (*zumbiba*) by the prophet Isaiah'; it may also form an abstract noun, as *nenok amangba amazi nenokdang süang* 'like your faith (*amangba*) be (it) to you.'

Though the words formed by this suffix are properly verbal adjectives—less often nouns—their derivation from verbs is still so present to the mind of the speaker that they may take a subject, like a verb; e. g. *Tsungrem teyare ashiba amato* 'like what the angel of God said' (*ashiba*). Here *teyar* takes the *e* of the nominative, as subject of the verb *ashi*. We should have expected *teyar age*, as in the example above.

A suffix nearly identical in form and use occurs in Lepcha; thus, from *rok* 'to read' is formed *rokbo* 'a reader'; from *gän* 'to be old,' *gänbo* 'one who is old'; from *tho* 'to place,' *thombo* 'placed.'

It is curious also to observe that a syllable *ba* is both the relative pronoun and the adjective-forming prefix in Khasi, a language which, though bordering on the Naga tongues, is supposed to be quite unrelated to them.

(b) *Comparison.* The comparison of adjectives is accomplished in a manner similar to that employed by other Tibeto-Burman languages; that is to say, the object which forms the standard of comparison is placed first, followed by a postposition, usually *dang* 'to'; next stands the other object; and last comes the adjective, without change of form and without adjunct. Examples are: *ziungtsüdang taküm tuluba* 'life is more than meat,' lit. 'meat-to life great-one (is)'; *idakzi kechi tali zumbidir* 'what one shall say more than this,' lit. 'this-to what much shall be said.' In



the first example the suffix *ba* is supposed to be identical with the personal pronoun *pa* 'he, she, it'; in the second example, *idakzi* is *i*, the pronominal element, *dak* the postposition, and *zi* a suffix often appended to pronouns and nouns, and seemingly having an intensive force.

Comparison on a similar plan is seen in the following sentence in Garo: *ia ācāknā bāte ua ācāk canbātā* 'that dog is smaller than this dog,' lit. 'this dog-to that dog small (is).'

The superlative is expressed by singling one out of the whole number of individuals as possessing the quality *par excellence*; e. g. *nenok rong nung shiba tuluba* 'whosoever is greatest among you,' lit. 'your group in who great-one (is).'

#### IV.—NUMERALS.

(a) *Cardinals.* The Ao has distinct names for the digits and a part of the tens. The compound terms from eleven to fifteen are formed by placing the smaller after the larger number, without a connective; thus, *teri-ka* 'ten-one,' *teri-asūm* 'ten-three,' *teri-pungu* 'ten-five.' From sixteen to twenty, twenty-six to thirty, and so on, a new method is adopted; e. g. *metsū maben trok* 'twenty not-brought six,' i. e. 'sixteen.' The explanation of this singular combination seems to be as follows: When the middle point between ten and twenty is reached, the mind forsakes ten, and, ceasing to add digits to that, runs forward to the second ten, and completes the calculation from that standpoint, saying 'six not yet brought to twenty,' etc. From twenty to thirty, thirty to forty, the same twofold procedure is repeated. 'Seventy' is *tenem ser metzū* 'fifty and twenty'; 'eighty' is *lir anasū* 'forty-twice'; 'ninety-nine' is *telang maben* 'hundred not-brought,' i. e. the number just short of a hundred.

The following table will illustrate the system of cardinals up to one hundred:

1 <i>ka</i>	11 <i>teri-ka</i>	21 <i>metsūri-ka</i>
2 <i>ana</i>	12 <i>teri-ana</i>	26 <i>semūr maben trok</i>
3 <i>asūm</i>	13 <i>teri-asūm</i>	30 <i>semūr</i>
4 <i>pezū</i>	14 <i>teri-pezū</i>	40 <i>lir</i>
5 <i>pungu</i>	15 <i>teri-pungu</i>	50 <i>tenem</i>
6 <i>trok</i>	16 <i>metsū maben trok</i>	60 <i>eokūr</i>
7 <i>tenet</i>	17 <i>metsū maben tenet</i>	70 <i>tenem ser metsū</i>
8 <i>ti</i>	18 <i>metsū maben ti</i>	80 <i>lir anasū</i>
9 <i>tūko</i>	19 <i>metsū maben tūko</i>	90 <i>telang tūko</i>
10 <i>ter</i>	20 <i>metsu</i>	100 <i>telang or noklang</i>

(b) *Ordinals*. The ordinals are formed by adding to the cardinals the suffix *puba* or *buba*; e. g. *anapuba* (-*buba*) 'second,' *asūmpuba* 'third.' An exception is *tamapuba* 'first,' which is not formed from the corresponding cardinal. To form ordinal adverbs a suffix *ben* is added to the cardinals; e. g. *asūmben* 'thirdly.' The same suffix forms multiplicatives, as *semürben* 'thirty-times.' This is literally 'thirty-bringsings,' if, as seems likely, *ben* is the common verb-root 'bring.' These forms may take at will the familiar prefix *te* (*l'*); e. g. *tanapuba*, *tasūmben*.

#### V.—PRONOUNS.

The Ao Naga has most of the classes of pronouns common to other languages. Whenever their case-relations are to be particularly defined, it is done by postpositions, in the same manner as with nouns.

(a) *Personal Pronouns*. These show some irregularities, both in their roots and in the formation of their plurals. Their forms are as follows:

	SING.		PLUR.
	Nom.	Oblique.	
1st	<i>ni</i>	<i>kūtang</i> ( <i>dang</i> ), etc.	{ <i>ozonok</i> , <i>ozo</i> , <i>onok</i> , <i>asenok</i> , <i>asen</i>
2d	<i>na</i>	<i>netang</i> , etc.	<i>nenok</i>
3d	<i>pa</i>	<i>pa-</i> or <i>badang</i> , etc.	<i>parenok</i> , <i>pare</i>

The nominative forms may take the suffix *e* under the same circumstances as do nouns. As already noticed, the plural suffix *nok* is for *lok* 'flock,' 'troop.' I have discovered no evidence of the so-called "inclusive" and "exclusive" forms of the 1st person plural.

(b) *Possessives*. It is doubtful whether the language has a formal possessive pronoun, since *kū* and *ne*, though used in a possessive sense before nouns, are also used with postpositions in other relations.

(c) *Demonstratives*. These have the following forms: *ya*; *aba*, *abazi*, *azi*; *iba*, *ibazi*. The first is commonly used as a near demonstrative, 'this'; the others—especially *azi*—as remote demonstratives, 'that.' They are used both adjectively and substantively, without change of form. Not infrequently they are employed—most often *iba*—for the third personal pronoun and for the definite article, for the expression of which there is no

other provision in the language. We have already referred to the syllable *zi*. Mr. Clark conjectures that it is identical with *ji* 'true'; hence *azi* would mean 'that indeed, truly.' It is most often appended to nouns which have just before been used in the discourse, and is about equivalent to 'the before-mentioned.'

The numeral *ka* or *kati* is often used to represent our indefinite article or the indefinite expression 'a certain.'

(d) *Interrogatives*. These are: *shir* or *shiba*, referring to persons; *kechi*, referring to things; and *koba*, relating to persons or things.

(e) *Relatives*. There is no distinct relative pronoun in the language, but the interrogatives are used in that sense. Relative clauses are not a favorite construction in Ao Naga, but occur oftener than in some other languages of this group, and more frequently in the colloquial than in the written language.

By the addition of certain intensive syllables, indefinite relatives are formed, as *kechisa* 'whatever,' *kechisarena* 'whatsoever,' *shiresa* 'whoever.'

(f) *Indefinites*. Besides the use of *ka*, referred to above, there are two indefinite pronouns, *shinga* and *kecha*, distinguished in the same manner as the interrogatives.

(g) *Reflexive*. The reflexive pronoun for all persons and numbers is *pei*.

## VI.—VERBS.

It is hardly necessary to say that the Ao verb has no elaborate array of forms. It makes no distinctions of person, number or voice; it is poor in modes; but it fairly expresses relations of time, and enters freely into composition with other root-words of various character, by which its central idea is modified.

We will now take up in order the various forms of the Ao verbal system, and illustrate their uses.

(a) *Tenses*. 1. The present indicative is formed by adding to the root the suffix *er*.<sup>1</sup> This suffix is probably the verb 'to be' in one of its many forms; so that *ni ben<sup>er</sup>* is literally 'I a bringer am,' or something like that. Roots ending in a vowel absorb the vowel of the ending; e. g. *ni zūmbir* (*zūmbi-er*) 'I speak,' *ni ngur* (*ngu-er*) 'I see.'

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the Scripture translations this suffix is represented as *ər*, but Mr. Clark informs me that he now considers the form written above more correct.

A progressive form of the same tense is produced by the suffix *dage* or *daka*, appended in like manner directly to the root; e. g. *ni bendage* 'I am bringing.'

2. A preterite tense is formed by prefixing the vowel *a* to the root, a quite unexpected correspondence with the "augment" of some inflecting languages; examples are: *ni aben* 'I brought'; *ni angu* 'I saw.' A few verbs do not take this prefix, but form their preterite by means of a helping-verb, of which construction we shall speak more fully hereafter; thus *ni zūmbi aka* 'I spoke.' The auxiliary verb in this example, *aka*, is the past tense of a verb which means 'to be' or 'to have,' as some of its uses indicate. When the initial letter of a root is *a*, this suffers no change in forming the preterite; e. g. *ni ashir* 'I say,' and *ni ashi* 'I said.'

Another form, which we may call the preterito-present, unites the augment of the past and the ending of the present tense, signifying thereby that the action lies partly in the past and partly in the present; thus, *ni am abener* means 'I am bringing bread,' and more, 'have brought some before'; while *ni am bendage* means only that 'I am on my way with some bread.'

3. The suffix *ogo* forms a tense commonly denoting a remote past, but sometimes to be translated by our perfect; e. g. *ni benogo* 'I brought' (some time ago), *tanur tefsetsū bushiba sūgo (sū-ogo)* 'he has died who sought to slay the boy.'

4. A future tense is formed by either of the two suffixes *di* and *tsū*. The former is thought to refer to a near future, and in some connections is hardly distinguishable from the present; thus, *ni bendi* 'I am on the point of bringing,' *ni shidi* 'I am going to say.' The suffix *tsū* refers more indefinitely to the future; e. g. *ni zūmbitsū* 'I shall say.'

(b) *Modes.* 1. A conditional mode is formed by adding to the root one of two suffixes, *ra* and *dir (di-ra)*. They both denote future condition, and the difference in their signification is said to be that the former denotes a condition uncertain of fulfillment, while the latter looks forward to its realization. The second form is oftenest used in relative clauses. Examples are: *kechi-aser nenok meimerdang nenoke meimera*, *kechi azangzūksū* 'for if ye love (*meimera*) them that love you, what profit is it?'; *zoko shirebenshidir aser saiyudir*, *pae kotak nūtsung rong nung tambu ta azatsū* 'but who shall do (*benshidir*) and teach (*saiyudir*) (them), he shall be called great in the number of the citizens of heaven.'



A third form of condition, which, however, does not often occur, requires the suffix *rang* (*ra-ang*), and answers to our future-perfect; thus, *ni arurang* 'if I shall have come,' *azi sürang* 'if that shall have been.' Sometimes the particle *bang* or *bangila* is added to *ra*; e. g. *nenok amang zibi zang tekatdanga sürabang* 'if your faith be as even one grain of mustard seed.'

The conclusion of such a sentence may be introduced by the conjunction *azangla* 'then'; or the syllable *la* may be attached to the verb or some other word; or it may be marked by no special sign. A conclusion may be expressed with condition implied; e. g. *ni zümbila* 'I would speak.' With the future, *la* gives the idea of certainty or necessity; e. g. *ni zümbitsüla* 'I shall or must speak.' The suffix *ba* may be used in the same connection, as *ni zümbitsülabä* 'I (am) he who must speak.'

2. An imperative mode, confined to the 2d and 3d persons, is formed by the suffix *ang*, when used affirmatively, but by the prefix *te* (*t'*) when used negatively; e. g. *na benang* 'bring thou,' *naleben* 'bring thou not.' The imperative is usually followed by a particle *ma* or *nei*, whose force is felt in softening the command.

(c) *Voice*. The Ao verb has no distinct passive form. This is a common fact of the Tibeto-Burman languages. Either the sentence is so constructed that there is no call for a passive, or the recipient of the action is made the object of the verb, and the latter is used impersonally; or a periphrastic form is constructed, the exact meaning of which is determined by the context. Much of the difficulty in regard to the expression of the passive idea in Ao Naga vanishes when one comes to clearly apprehend the fact that most of the verbs have both a transitive and an intransitive sense. This feature is familiar enough, though far less common, in English. We say the ship "drives" or "is driven" before the wind; it "breaks" or "is broken" with difficulty, and so on. Illustrations of Ao usage are: *Simon, shibadang Pilor azar* 'Simon, who is called Peter,' lit. 'whom (one) calls Peter'; *ibae indang o ya zilua-lir* 'concerning him this word is written,' where *zilua* is perf. ptc. (here used intransitively) of *zilu* 'to write,' and *lir* is present indic. of *li* 'to be'; *ya zümbi-akar* 'this is (customarily) said,' where *zümbi* is simple root 'to say,' and *akar* is "preterito-present" of *ka* 'to be'; *alümle nisungdang zümbia akaba o ya* 'this word which was said to men of old time.' Such combinations as in the second example are sometimes active, e. g. *ni ya azak benshia-lir* 'I have done all this.'

(d) *Infinitive and Participles.* The infinitive is properly the naked root in the simple verb, and so has no place in its system of "forms." Verbal nouns are constantly used in Ao in situations where the infinitive occurs in the inflecting languages. There are two forms which answer to participles. The first ends in *er*, and represents in general a present active participle; e. g. *bener* 'bringing,' *zūmbir* 'speaking,' *zilur* 'writing'; the second ends in *a*, and ordinarily translates our perfect participle; e. g. *bena* 'having brought,' *zūmbia* 'having spoken,' *zilua* 'having written.' However, this distinction is not strictly maintained, and they are sometimes used interchangeably, according to certain demands of style. From what has been said under the head of voice, it will now be quite plain that these forms correspond to passive as well as active participles in English.

The following examples will illustrate their uses: *tanuro tetzūna anir Israel limae oang* 'taking (*anir*) the boy and his mother (lit. 'mother-two'), go into the land of Israel'; *kare tashi temetūr Yirusaleme tonga ashi* 'certain wise men, having come (*tonga*) to Jerusalem, said'; *Yisue ano tetezūtsū ka zūmbia ashi* 'Jesus, uttering one more parable, said,' where *zūmbir* would be more exact; *pa arur mena ashi* 'he, having come and taken his seat, said,' where *arur mena* is better style than *arua mena*, in this connection, though less exact.

(e) *Periphrastic Forms.* This subject has already been illustrated in part, and it will only be necessary to add a few more examples out of a considerable variety. *Iba Yohan ot zūng age atakpa scū abena ali* 'that John wore (*abena-ali*) a garment woven of camel's hair.' If *aben* had been used, instead of *abena-ali*, it would not have implied habitual wearing, as does the latter, since *li* often means 'to abide,' 'to live.' *Ainkar mapa ayega meyangluka ma* 'have we not done many mighty works?' *Temeshi pure kanga ngunū-aka* 'righteous people greatly desired to see.' *Idangyungzi pa shishi-adok* 'then she arose.' *Swarūr-zi o Zūmbia-adok* 'the dumb man spake.' In the last examples the verb *dok* properly means 'to appear,' but is often used where its original sense is not appropriate; in other words, it shows a tendency to become a merely formative element. It should be understood, however, that such expressions as these above are in general loose combinations, which are hardly entitled to be called "forms" of the verb, in the sense in which that term is understood in the inflecting languages.

(f) *Substantive Verbs*. As in other languages, existence is predicated by a variety of verbs, which doubtless originally differed in meaning, though this difference now in some degree eludes detection. Examples are: *ak* or *ka*; *aet* or *et*; *asü* or *sü*; *er*; *ali*, *li*, *le*, *la*; *küm*; *dok*. Of these, *asü* sometimes means 'to cause to be,' and so 'to build'; *li* or *le* 'to reside'; *ka* 'to have'; *dok* 'to appear,' etc.

(g) *Intensive Forms*. An action may be emphasized by doubling the verb; thus, *Raühela pei chir indang zeba-zeba* 'Rachel weeping bitterly for her children.'

(h) *Verbal Modifiers*. It has already been remarked that the simple verb in Ao freely takes on syllables which modify in a variety of ways its original sense. Some of these form the familiar secondary conjugations of the inflecting languages. The following are examples: *daktsü* gives to a root a causative sense; e. g. *ni bendaktsür* 'I cause to bear,' i. e. send or send for; *tsü* determines an action as done for another; e. g. *ne nu nuk nunge anakzi endoktsütsü zungzunga angutsü* 'thou shalt see clearly to cast out (*endoktsütsü*) the mote from thy brother's eye'; *nü* forms desideratives; e. g. from *pala* 'to divorce' is derived *palanü* 'to desire to divorce'; *tet* or *ter* gives a potential sense, as *yanglutet* 'able to make'; *ma* signifies 'to finish,' as *zümbima* 'to finish speaking'; *tep* means mutually, as *meimtep* 'to love one another'; *täm*, like *ma*, means 'to bring to an end'; *set* gives the idea of completeness, as *tefset* 'to thoroughly kill'; *to* gives the sense of an act done in part, as *chilo* 'to eat some of'; *lok* 'to attach to,' as *azonglok* 'to lift up and fasten,' as a load on an animal's back; *den* or *ten* gives the idea of association, as *benden* 'to gather together'; *lok* is 'off,' 'away,' as *leptok* 'cut off'; *zük* has a variety of meanings; e. g. (1) to complete successfully, as *zümbizük* 'to talk to good purpose'; (2) it reverses the action of the verb, as *aküm* is to bring the animals up to the village, but *aküm-zük*, to let them loose; (3) to bring to an end, as *ruzük* to finish reaping; *zen* signifies repetition, as *tsunglu aruzen* 'the rain came continually'; *shia* alone is a prefix, and answers to the English prefix *re-*, as *shia-arü* 'come back' or 'revive,' *shia-agütsü* 'to give back,' 'restore.'

It seems probable that these modifying syllables are, in their origin, verbs; but I am unable to give a more exact account of them.

(i) *Verbal Synonyms*. The language is rich in verbs which

denote variations of the same general act; thus, *shidok* denotes 'wash' or 'cleanse' in general, *mei* 'to wash the face,' *metsük* 'to wash the hands,' *tzüsen* 'to immerse,' and so on.

In the foregoing brief outline of the Ao Naga verb, it has not surprised us to find that it has no full apparatus of forms to express nice shades of thought; indeed, a people without letters, like the Nagas, would have little call to invent expressions for thoughts which had no place in their minds. It is not strange, too, that the forms employed are not used with absolute consistency, when we recall the failings of even cultivated languages in this respect.

#### VII.—ADVERBS.

These words might, perhaps, better be called adverbial phrases, since they are, in great part, abbreviated sentences or combinations of a pronominal element with a postposition. Below is a list of those in most common use:

<i>angnunge</i> , thence.	<i>kode</i> , in any way.
<i>angnungzi</i> , thence.	<i>kolene</i> , whither (interrog. and rel.)
<i>angzi</i> , there.	<i>kolen nunge</i> , whence.
<i>au</i> , yes.	<i>komama</i> , like what?
<i>azage</i> , thither.	<i>kong</i> , where?
<i>azi ode</i> , so.	<i>konge</i> , whither?
<i>elengzi</i> , thither.	<i>kong nunge</i> , whence?
<i>ibagütsüe</i> , then, after that.	<i>kopiga</i> , how far?
<i>idangyongzi</i> , immediately.	<i>kün kün</i> , often, sometimes.
<i>idangzi</i> , then.	<i>lene</i> , toward.
<i>imamae</i> , thus.	<i>ma</i> (interrog. and softening particle).
<i>kaatsü</i> , why?	<i>me(m')</i> (interrog. & neg. particle).
<i>kanga</i> , greatly, very.	<i>nunga</i> , no.
<i>kechiba</i> , why?	<i>nungta</i> , no.
<i>kechi koda</i> , how?	<i>qeiben</i> , how many times?
<i>kechinung</i> , where?	<i>tamasa</i> , first.
<i>kechiyong</i> , why?	<i>tang</i> , now.
<i>kechisa</i> , why?	<i>tangyunge</i> , quickly.
<i>kechishi</i> , why?	<i>yage</i> , hither.
<i>kechisüdang</i> , when?	<i>yakte</i> , quickly.
<i>kechisünung</i> , wherefore.	<i>yamae</i> , thus.
<i>keleme</i> , along with.	<i>yange</i> , here.
<i>kena</i> , now.	<i>yasür</i> , then, afterward.
<i>koda</i> , in any way, how?	<i>zungzunga</i> , clearly.
<i>kodang</i> when (interrog. and rel.).	
<i>kodanga</i> , at any time.	



## VIII.—POSTPOSITIONS.

The words which we are wont to call prepositions, because of their position relatively to the governed noun, may be called, for a like reason, postpositions in Ao Naga. The following are some of these words, with their ordinary significations :

<i>age</i> , by, with.	<i>kelene</i> , across.
<i>alüma</i> , beyond.	<i>madak</i> , upon, over.
<i>anüma</i> , against.	<i>madang</i> , before, in presence of.
<i>asoshi</i> , for sake of, in order to.	<i>madange</i> , before, to presence of.
<i>atüma</i> , by (in oath).	<i>melen</i> , in place of.
<i>dak</i> , in, at, etc.	<i>meyong</i> , against, for.
<i>dang</i> ( <i>tang</i> ), to, at, etc.	<i>nung</i> , at, in, to, on, by.
<i>dange</i> , into, to.	<i>nungdang</i> , onto, etc.
<i>den</i> ( <i>ten</i> ), with.	<i>sülen</i> , after.
<i>donga</i> , to, until, unto.	<i>tashi</i> , until, as far as.
<i>indang</i> , respecting.	<i>yong</i> , for (price).
<i>kelen</i> , after, beyond.	

*Dak* and *dang* are used in a variety of ways, according to the connection, and do not readily submit to precise definition. In compounds *dak* usually has the sense of 'place,' as *amendak* 'sitting-place,' *imtak* 'village-place.' *Dang* often governs a verb in the sense of 'while'; e. g. *Babel nung alidang* 'while (he) was in Babylon.' *Indang* occasionally means 'thing.'

The following are a few examples of the uses of postpositions : *Abenzi asong asoshi kanga tebilim* 'therefore be not anxious for the morrow.' *Herod tsuba aser pa den Yirusalem nungür azak* 'Herod the king and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem with him.' *Yisue Yohan indang telokdang o ya zümbi meso* 'Jesus began to speak this word to the multitude concerning John.' *Koba pur pei anüma küptepera* 'if any people are divided against themselves.' *Aser Yisue tzü kelene aotsü melar* 'and Jesus bids to go across the water.'

## IX.—CONJUNCTIONS.

It is well known that languages of this type have no such elaborately articulated sentences, with their array of co-ordinate and subordinate clauses, as do the inflecting languages. Hence there is no such call for connectives; but prepositional phrases and participial expressions are favorite styles of structure. There

are, however, certain words—for the most part of very transparent origin—that serve to unite single words and clauses. The following are in most common use :

<i>abenzi</i> , therefore.	<i>ka</i> , though.
<i>ano</i> , and more.	<i>kechiaser</i> , for, because.
<i>anungzi</i> , therefore.	<i>kechisünung</i> , wherefore.
<i>aser</i> , and.	<i>masü-masü</i> , neither—nor.
<i>ashiko</i> , lest, perhaps.	<i>mesüra</i> , or (if not).
<i>azage</i> , therefore.	<i>nungzi</i> , so that.
<i>azangla</i> , then (in apodosis).	<i>saka</i> , but (antithetical).
<i>aziage</i> , therefore.	<i>süşia-süşia</i> , either—or.
<i>azisaka</i> , but, nevertheless.	<i>yaser</i> , and so.
<i>azisür</i> , then, afterward.	<i>zokorla</i> , but.
<i>bangila</i> , if (in condition).	

The origin of a great part of this list seems obvious at a glance ; thus, *azage* and the fuller *aziage* are *azi* + *age* = 'by that' ; *masü* is *me* + *asü* = 'is not' ; *mesüra* is *me* + *sü* + *ra* = 'if is not,' etc.

#### X.—SYNTAX.

The examples and explanatory remarks of the preceding pages have already given some insight into the structure of Ao Naga sentences.

For the reason stated above, and because we are dealing with the speech of rude mountaineers, the syntax of the language is marked by great simplicity. The order of the sentence is the inverted one, the verb standing last and the subject first, though much freedom as to position is allowed the latter. Interrogative pronouns and adverbs stand first less often than in English ; e. g. *Krista kechi nung asotsü* 'Christ in what place will be born?' Nouns or pronouns standing in a possessive relation precede the nouns they limit. Adjectives—especially those signifying 'good' or 'bad'—as a rule follow nouns ; but there are numerous exceptions.

Relative clauses and all constructions taking their place stand before antecedent clauses ; e. g. *nenok kechi angu kechi angashi azi Yohandang oa shiang* 'what ye have seen, what heard, that, having gone to John, tell.' On this principle, verbal adjectives in *ba* stand before their nouns ; e. g. *pae kidang aliba nisung azak sangwatsü* 'it lighteth all men who are in the house.'

The same fact is observed in the frequent construction where, instead of a clause introduced by a relative adverb of time, it is treated as a substantive and governed by some one of the ordinary postpositions. It may take a subject bearing the usual nominative sign, and a verb in any tense. Examples are: *pei zabaso am mishi nung tebue lung agütsütsü* 'if his son ask for bread, will a father give a stone?' lit. 'at his son asking for bread,' etc.; *Yisue parenokdange marudange* 'when Jesus had not come to them,' lit. 'at the not coming of Jesus to them.'

A purpose clause may be expressed in a similar way by the use of a postposition. To this end *asoshi* 'for the sake of' is employed; e. g. *nisunge angutsü asoshi nenoke parenok madang tim mapa teyanglu* 'in order that men may see (them), do ye not righteous deeds before them,' lit. 'for the sake of men seeing,' etc. However, the more regular form to express purpose is a verbal noun which takes the suffix *tsü* and, at pleasure, the prefix *te* (*t'*), answering to our infinitive. As we have seen also, the verbal in *e* may be made to express the same idea. The copula is sometimes omitted.

I have now set forth in its principal features the structure of the Zwingi dialect of the Ao language, so far as I have been able to learn it from the sources named at the beginning of this paper. It would have been useful could I have pointed out the degree of relationship existing between the Ao and the other languages of this numerously divided people, particularly the Angami Naga; but the material for the comparison is not yet forthcoming, though it is reported that a grammar and vocabulary of the last-named tongue are ready for publication.

It is the well-nigh universal practice of writers on language, based, one may well suppose, on no very careful researches, to class all the rude tongues between Tibet and Burma among the monosyllabic languages, of which Chinese is the most prominent representative. But the tendency to combine roots, reducing some to a servile condition, is so marked, and has gone so far—as I have abundantly shown—that we shall be obliged either to enlarge our definition of a monosyllabic language, or to admit that this speech lies just over the border, among languages in the early stages of agglutination.<sup>1</sup> As compared with the Garo and the

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Clark's latest utterance to me on this subject is as follows: "I should say that the Ao Naga language, in its present state, is unquestionably dissyllabic or polysyllabic, so much so that it is difficult to find short words for

Lepcha, of which I recently gave an account, it does not seem to have advanced quite so far toward the higher type of structure.

The traditions of the Ao tribe point to an earlier home farther to the northeast, on the high ranges forming the watershed between Assam and Burma. There, as the story goes, they formed a single village; but in course of time, as their numbers increased, they gradually worked their way west and south, conquering or driving out weaker tribes, until they reached their present homes. The superior physical development and manly bearing of this people, compared with those of adjacent tribes of the same stock, give probability to this legend.

I am not without hope that, when British control and missionary labor shall have brought these rude hill tribes into a condition to admit of more direct observation, we shall be in a position not only to untangle and classify the confused mass of tongues spoken in Northeastern India and Burma, but to obtain thereby some trustworthy hints as to the wider ethnical relations and early wanderings of these interesting, but hitherto little-known, peoples.

I have only to add that, before making a final revision of this paper, I submitted it to Mr. Clark for examination. I have freely availed myself of the corrections and explanations which he had the kindness to make, and so have an added confidence that the general character of the language has been accurately represented.

#### SPECIMEN OF AO NAGA.<sup>1</sup>

##### *The Temptation.*—Matt. iv. 1-11.

(1) Ibagütsüe Mozinge Yisu atitangtsü asoshi, Tanelae padang areme anir ao. (2) Aser lir nü lir aunung lumiseta ali nung Yisu ya adok. (3) Idangzi tatitangbae pa anasae arua ashi, nae Tsungrem chir süra azangla lung ya am kümdakzang. (4) Angzi pae langzüa ashi, nisunge am tesa age malitsü zokorla Tsungrem bang nunge adokba o azak; azi oda zilua lir.

(5) Idangzi Mozinge padang temeshi imti anir lungki kolak nung mendaktsür, (6) padang ashir, nae Tsungrem chir süra, nae sasa tsükang; kechiaser azi oda zilua lir, na asoshi Tsungreme pei

sentences in making a primer for children learning to read. Yet the monosyllabic base of the language is quite apparent." This is just the view to which my own study of the language has brought me.

<sup>1</sup> In making this extract I have not thought it important to change the connecting-vowel *ä* to *e*, as suggested on a former page.



teyartüm melatsü, aser na tetsung lung nung memetsütsü, parenok netang tekabo age azongzütsü. (7) Yisue padang ashi, nü Bu anung Tsungrem mulung tatitang ma ; ano ya mae zilua lir.

(8) Tana, Mozinge padang tenemti anir, alima nung im azak aser parenok nukshidaksütsü azak sai yua padang ashir, (9) nae aputaka ni külümüra bangila, ya azak ni ne nung agütsüdi. (10) Angzi Yisue padang ashir, teli tsükchir Mozing, kechiaser ya zilua lir, na pei Tebu anung Tsungrem külümang aser pa sa tenzü kang. (11) Idangzi Mozinge padang toksür ao aser reprangang, kotak teyartüme arua yari.

## VOCABULARY.

*adok*, imperf. indic. of *dok* 'appear,' 'become.'

*adokba*, verbal adj. from the same verb, sig. 'which appeareth, proceedeth.'

*age*, postpo. 'with,' 'by.'

*agütsüdi*, fut. indic. of *agütsü* (root *gü* or *kü*) 'give'; *di*, suf. of near future, 'will at once give'; apodosis of cond. clause.

*ali*, impf. indic. of *li* 'be'; used here as auxiliary verb.

*alima*, 'world.'

*am*, 'bread.'

*anasae*, 'near to'; derived from *ana* 'two,' hence lit. 'second to.'

*angzi*, (*a-dang-zi*?) 'then.'

*anir*, pres. indic. or pres. ptc. of *ani* 'lead.'

*ano*, 'again'; derived from *ana* 'two.'

*anung*, 'sky,' 'heaven.'

*ao*, impf. indic. of *o* 'go.'

*aputaka*, pf. ptc. of *aputak* 'prostrate,' 'kneel.'

*areme*, 'desert'; with suf. *e*, denoting end of motion.

*arua*, pf. ptc. of *aru* 'come.'

*aser*, 'and.'

*ashi*, impf. indic. of *ashi* 'say'; *ashir*, pres. indic. of same verb.

*asoshi*, postpo. 'for sake of,' 'in order to.'

*atilangtsü*, from *atilang* 'tempt'; used as a verbal noun, governed by *asoshi*, but takes a subject and object; lit. 'for the sake of Satan tempting Jesus.'

*aunung*, 'night'; here plural.

*azak*, 'all,' 'every.'

*azangla*, 'then'; used sometimes, as here, with apodosis of cond. cl.

*azi oda*, 'thus.'

*azongzüksü*, fut. indic. of *azongzük* 'support'; composed of *azong* or *zong* 'take' and *zük*, which gives the idea of complete or successful action, 'hold securely.'

*bang*, 'mouth.'

*bangila*, particle sometimes used in protasis of cond. clauses.

*Bu*, 'father,' 'Lord.'

*chir*, 'child'; here 'son.'

*ibagütsü*, 'then'; composed of pro. *iba* 'this' + *agütsü* 'give' + adverbial suf. *e*; lit. 'granting this.'

*idangzi* (*i-dang-zí*), 'then.'

*im*, 'town,' 'kingdoms' in v. 8; suf. *ti* in *imti* and *tenemti* emphatic, 'great town,' 'lofty mountain.'

*kechiaser*, 'for.'

*kolak*, 'head,' 'pinnacle.'

*kotak*, 'heaven.'

*külümang*, imperative of *külüm* 'worship.'

*külümura*, cond. mode of same verb; *ra*, mode-sign.

*kümdakzang*, imperative of *küm* 'become,' with causative suf. *daktsü*, which contracts to *dakz* before ending.

*langzúa*, pf. ptc. of *langzú* 'answer'; used here like pres. ptc.

*lir*, pres. indic. of *li* 'be,' 'abide.'

*lir*, 'forty.'

*lumiseta*, pf. ptc. of *lumiset* 'fast'; *set* gives idea of complete abstinence; with *ali* equivalent to plupf. tense; both governed by *nung* in sense of 'when,' 'after.'

*lung*, 'stone'; plural in v. 3.

*lungki*, 'stone-house,' here 'temple.'

*ma*, a particle used to soften force of imperative.

*mae*, from *ma* 'front,' 'face,' with adverbial suf. *e*; *ya mae* 'in this manner,' 'thus.'

*malitsü*, fut. indic. of *li* or *ali* with negative prefix; 'shall not live.'

*melatsü*, fut. indic. of *mela* 'command.'

*memetsütsü*, 'in order not to dash'; the usual construction to express purpose; composed of neg. prefix *me* + verb *metsü* + "final" suffix *tsü*.

*mendaktsür*, pres. indic. or ptc. of *men* 'sit,' with causative suffix.

*Mozinge*, 'Satan,' with nominative suffix *e*.

*mulung*, 'mind,' 'heart.'

*na*, pronoun, 2d person; so *nae* with nom. suffix.

*ne*, oblique form of same pro.; so *netang* with postpo. *lang* for *dang*.

*ni*, pronoun, 1st person; both subject and object in v. 9.

*nisunge*, 'men,' 'mankind,' with nom. suffix.

*nü*, 'day'; from *anü* 'sun'; here plural.

*nu*, pro. of 2d person, in possessive relation.

*nukshidaktsütsü*, 'glory.'

*nung*, postpo. 'on,' 'against,' 'in,' 'to' in verses 5, 6, 8 and 9, respectively; 'after' or 'when' in v. 2.

*nunge*, postpo. 'from.'

*o*, 'word.'

*pa*, pronoun, 3d person, as object; so *padang*; *pae* nom.; *parenok*, plural of same, suf. *nok* for *lok* 'flock.'

*pei*, reflexive pronoun for all persons.

*reprangang*, imper. mode of *reprang* 'behold.'

*sa* emphasizes preceding word, here equivalent to 'only'; *sasa*, the same doubled, here equals 'self.'

*saiyua*, pf. ptc. of *saiyu* 'show.'

*süra*, cond. mode of *sü* 'be.'

*tana*, 'again'; derived from *ana* 'two,' with prefix *te* (*t'*).

*Tanelae*, 'Spirit,' with nom. suffix.

*tatilang*, prohibitive imper. from *atitang*.

*tatilangbae*, 'tempter,' from *atitang* with prefix *te* (*t'*) and suf. *ba*.

*Tebu*, same as *Bu*, with prefix *te*.

*tekabo*, 'hand'; here plural; suf. *bo* usually rendered 'as to'; here of doubtful force.

*teli*, prohibitive imper. of *li* 'be,' 'stay'; here 'stay not,' 'away!'

*temeshi*, 'holy.'

*tenemti*, 'mountain'; for suf. *ti*, see *imti*.

*tenzü kang*, imper. of *tenzü k* 'serve.'

*tesa*, 'alone'; emphatic *sa* with prefix *te*.

*tetsung*, 'foot.'

*teyartüm*, 'angels,' with plur. suffix.

*toksür*, pres. ptc. of *toksü* 'leave.'

*tsükang*, 'fall,' 'cast'; imper. of *tsük*.

*tsükchir*, 'enemy.'

*Tsungrem*, 'God.'

*ya*, 'this,' 'these.'

*ya*, 'hungry.'

*yari*, impf. of *yari* 'minister,' without prefix *a*.

*Yisue*, 'Jesus,' with nom. suffix.

*zilua*, pf. ptc. of *zilu* 'write'; with *lir* as auxiliary, 'is written.'

*zokorla*, 'but.'

JOHN AVERY.

BOWDOIN COLLEGE.



## NOTES.

### A PASSAGE IN THE ANGLO-SAXON POEM "THE RUIN," CRITICALLY DISCUSSED.

The little fragment of "The Ruin" (Exeter Book, 123<sup>b</sup>-124<sup>b</sup>) is one of the most charming specimens of Old English poetry, and has been praised by every critic. The remnant that is left makes us regret beyond measure that the greater part has been lost, and that even in the extant portion some passages are wholly corrupt through missing words. It is the purpose of this paper to discuss what is possibly the most difficult passage in the poem. The MS reading, as given by Prof. Walker (Bibliothek d. Ags. Poesie, Bd. I, p. 297), is as follows:

- l. 22. for þon þas hofu dreorgiað and þæs teafor  
geapa tigelum sceadeð hrost beages rof, etc.

The first clause is clear enough: Forþon þas hofu drêorgiað: "therefore these courts are desolate." *Drêorgiað* is a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, but is evidently formed from the adj. *drêorig* (cf. *hât* > *hâtian*, *hâlig* > *hâlgian*), and means *to be sad, desolate, deserted*. Grein (Bibliothek I, p. 248, 1857) and Leo (*Carmen Anglosaxonicum*, . . . *quod inscribitur Ruinae*, Halle'sche Universitätschrift, 1865) read *dreorgað* without either authority or reason. Conybeare (Illustrations of Anglo-Saxon Poetry, p. 249) reads *hofa*. After *dreorgiað* he places a semicolon, and gives the next sentence as follows:

and ðæs teafor geapu,  
tigelum sceadeð,  
hrost beagas-rof  
hryre wong gecrong,  
gebrocen to beorgum.

The translation given is: *et haec purpurea (regalis Domus) prona, tegulis divulsis, cubiculum annuliferi herois ruina in campum prolapsa est, inter urbis fragmenta*. It would be sheer waste of space to examine this translation critically; a first glance shows that Conybeare merely attempted to give the general sense of the passage. Thorpe (Codex Exoniensis, 1842, p. 477) ends the sen-

tence, as I have done above, with *rof*, and translates: "Therefore these courts are dreary and its purple arch with its tiles shades the roost, proud of its diadem." *Geapu* here then means *arch*, and *þæs* is gen. sing. *referring to a plural antecedent (sic !)*. *Sceadeð* he derives from *sceadu*, shade (cf. *besceadeð*, Sol. and Sat. v. 339). By *purple* Thorpe understands *regal*, but what means "roost, proud of its diadem"? This is as dark as the Anglo-Saxon text itself.

Grein (Bibliothek) has *þas teafor—geapu*, and would probably translate, "and the red (colored) gates." *Tæafor* is a kind of coloring matter, *minium*, and answers to Old Norse *taufur*, O. H. G. *zoubar*, etc. (cf. *tiver*, where the *ɪ* is, as I take it, a provincial shortening out of *ēē* < A.-S. *ēa*). The history of these words has not yet been satisfactorily cleared up (*vid.* Schade, *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch*, and Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*), yet the meaning of the Anglo-Saxon word can hardly be disputed. In this case it seems to be used for the sake of alliteration. *Geapu* Grein evidently considers as nom. pl., and identifies the word with O. N. *gap*. There is, however, no sufficient reason for changing the MS reading; *geapa* may be a weak nom. sing., and *þæs* (instead of *þes*) occurs also in verses 1 and 9. The only other instance I have seen of this form is in *Crist* and *Satan*, v. 100, where, however, a second hand has changed it into *þes* (*vid.* Sievers' *Collation*, Haupt's *Zeitschrift*, XV 456). Toller-Bosworth reads *geapu*, *expanse*; there seems to me, however, to be no doubt of the shortness of the first syllable in *geapa*, as also in *geapian*, and I know no reason why the adj. *geap* should not be included. The modern Eng. *gap* and *gape*; O. N. *gap*, *gapa*; M. H. G. *gaffen*; Low German *gapen*, all speak for *ǣ*. Leo translates: "und darum diese rothen Lücken." What he means by these "rothe Lücken" is not perfectly clear, yet it seems to be an allusion to breaches in the walls. In the second volume of his *Sprachschatz*, Grein turns from his former interpretation, rejects the idea that *tæafor* in this passage is the usual word meaning *minium*, compares it rather with O. N. *toft* = "ein Hügelchen, ein für einen Bau bestimmter Platz," and gives as its meaning: "Baustätte mit den äusseren Wänden des Hauses."<sup>1</sup> However pleasant such an interpretation would be, it cannot be allowed. *Tæafor* and *toft*

<sup>1</sup> Grein thus makes two distinct words; *teafor* = *minium* (no etymology given), and *tedfor* = building lot, corresponding at the same time to O. N. *toft* and *taufur*, O. H. G. *zoubar*, etc.

cannot be identified; Anglo-Saxon *ēa* calls for O. N., as for Gothic, *au*, and *tēafor* must be the same word as O. N. *tauf*, O. H. G. *zoubar*, etc. (cf. *rēad*, Got. *rauds*, O. N. *rauðr*; *bēag*, O. N. *baugr*).

In verse 31<sup>b</sup> Grein (Bibliothek) reads:

tigelum sceardeð (?)  
hrōst beāges rōf.

How he would translate this I am not perfectly sure, as he has not considered this reading at all in his *Sprachschatz*. In *sceardeð* he doubtless thought of a connection with *scearde* (v. 5). Afterwards (Germania X, p. 422) he returns to the MS reading *sceadeð*, makes *hrōst-bedges* a compound, and, instead of *rōf*, reads *hrōf*. This last is no very violent alteration, since initial *h*, especially in union with *r*, *l*, and *w*, often falls away (cf. Sievers, §217, note). *Sceadeð* is here no derivative from *sceadu*, but is to be written *sceadeð*, and is the same as Gothic *skaidan*, O. H. G. *sceidan*, etc. *Hrōst* seems to be the old form of present *roost*, and is probably related to *hrōf*. In *Heliand* (70<sup>33</sup>) the word occurs in the signification *roof*, which agrees with its dialectic use in Scotland (cf. Toller-Bosworth s. v.). What means, though, *hrōst-bedges*? *Bēag* signifies ring, bracelet, crown, etc. From this last meaning Grein makes the transition to *summit*, *gable*, and translates *hrōst-bedg* with *corona canteriorum*, i. e. "Karniess des Dachsparrens" or "Dachsparrenwerk." Such a transition seems to me both violent and unwarranted. Here again the MS reading, *hrost beages rōf*, seems to me better than any change. *Hrōst* I take to mean *roof*, yet here used synecdochically for *house*, *palace*, just as Lat. *tectum*. Similar cases may be seen in *ecg* = sword, *rand* and *bordhrēða* = shield, *sceaft* = spear, etc.

*Bēages rōf* I translate, then, *renowned for its treasures*, that is, for that dispensing of rings, bracelets, etc., to the followers of the princes. Compare the frequent allusion to this custom in *Bēowulf*, as seen in the words *bēag*, *bēag-gyfa*, *bēah-hord*, *bēah-sele*, etc. *Rōf* means *strong*, *valiant*, but also *renowned*. So Zupitza translates it, El. 50, and Grein, And. 473. The etymology is not perfectly clear. The word occurs in no other Teutonic dialect save Old Saxon, and there seems plainly to mean *renowned* (cf. Schade, *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch* s. v., and Diefenbach, *Vergl. Wörterbuch* s. *hropjan*). For this meaning in A.-S. compare further the compounds *sigerōf* and *dadrōf*. The use of the limiting gen. with *rōf*, as with other similar adjectives, needs no remark.

J. H. KIRKLAND.

## ON HERODOTUS VII 162.

The words οὗτος δὲ ὁ νόος τοῦ ῥήματος τὸ ἐθέλει λέγειν· δῆλα γὰρ ὡς ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἐστὶ τὸ ἔαρ δοκιμώτατον, τῆς δὲ τῶν Ἑλλήνων στρατιῆς τὴν ἑωντοῦ στρατιήν, which are found in all the MSS, have given editors of Herodotus much trouble. Some have rejected them all, holding them to have been a marginal note of a reader to the figure used by Gelon; others have regarded only τὸ ἐθέλει λέγειν as an interpolation. But by striking out this clause we do not get rid of the whole difficulty; for it is by no means evident that ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἐστὶ τὸ ἔαρ δοκιμώτατον, and even less so is it that Gelon's troops were the δοκιμωτάτη στρατιή of the Greek army. It is manifest, however, that that is just what Gelon meant. I think that this sense can be clearly brought out, and all trouble removed, if we agree to read the passage thus: οὗτος δὲ ὁ νόος τοῦ ῥήματος· δῆλα γὰρ ὅτι ἐθέλει λέγειν ὡς κ. τ. λ. But how did the false reading get into all the MSS? This question I will endeavor to answer.

Stein, in the preface to his critical edition, p. 21, says that he believes all our MSS are to be traced to a common archetype and parent, which he calls Ω. Now, I suppose that in the MS of which Ω was a copy τ<sub>ο</sub> (= ὅτι) ἐθέλει λέγειν, omitted from the text by oversight, was added above the line; and that the copyist restored it to the text in Ω, but, reading τ<sub>ο</sub> for τό, placed it wrongly after ῥήματος. It will be conceded, I think, that the following ὡς easily led to the omission of ὅτι ἐθέλει λέγειν, since the construction of δῆλα was not thereby interfered with, and more easily to the error made in putting it before δῆλα.

GEO. S. THOMAS.



## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Iliad, edited, with English Notes and Introduction, by WALTER LEAF, M. A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Vol. I, Books I-XII, XXVIII, 422. Macmillan & Co., 1886.

The rapidity with which editions of Homer are given to the world is, perhaps, no longer so adequate a criterion of the vigor of philological life as it was, for example, between 1525 and 1606, when no less than sixteen complete editions in Germany attest the zeal of the Humanists. The significance of this *magnus proventus* is obvious when we contrast such a season of fruitfulness with that sterile age between 1606 and 1759 (the date of Ernesti's text), which gave birth to but a single edition. The last decennium has been more fruitful than perhaps any other in the history of Homeric investigation; and if we take into consideration the boldness of its criticism, aiming not merely at the reconstruction of a text antedating the supposed recension of Pisistratus, but even at the establishment of an Aiolic Homer, and the more cautious attempts at distinguishing the Aristarchean from the vulgate text, we must award to it the palm of superiority over many of its fellows. An eminent English scholar has even asserted that the ultimate influence of a recent edition will be comparable to the influence exercised by the *Prolegomena* of Wolf.

Some recent German editions, notably that of Fäsi, under the hands of the late Dr. Hinrichs, have gradually become the representatives of more special lines of criticism; and while English and American scholars have been waiting for the authoritative utterances of the best English criticism in an *editio critica* from the Provost of Oriel, Mr. Leaf has drawn his *vñ̃a mēlaivav* (the *atramentum* of Lobeck) *eis āla diav*, and produced an edition which professes allegiance to no single one of the many methods designed to initiate the neophyte into the mysteries attendant upon the critical study of the epopee. Though Mr. Leaf is not of the persuasion that the soul of Homer, after years of Pythagorean metempsychosis, transmigrated into the body of Aristarchus only to be subjected to a renewed birth in Lehrs, he is, nevertheless, an adherent of that form of Königsbergerism of which Ludwig is the *πρόμαχος*, honoring the memory of the "mighty master" by maintaining a vigorous warfare against that school of criticism which refuses to return from its *schwindelnden Höhen auf den festen Boden der Wirklichkeit*—a reality to be found in the utterances of tradition alone.

The probability of the critic's attaining his ultimate goal in the restoration of the primitive form of the Iliad appears to Mr. Leaf so far distant, that notwithstanding traces are manifest of an inclination to suffer the ingression of antique forms, he establishes the earliest tradition as the canon of criticism by which he estimates the value of every reading. This method, a commonplace among conservative critics, is tinged with an admixture of radicalism in the case of our editor, who is not content with an attempt at reproducing the text of Aristarchus, but aims at producing an Iliad approximately identical

with that from which Thucydides, Herodotus, or even Pindar drew their inspiration. He assures us that we are so fortunate as to be able to carry tradition back from our present vulgate to the text of Antimachus of Colophon, whose "floruit" lies in the middle or perhaps end of the fifth century. The text of the author of the *Thebais* he claims to be identical with the *vulgata* emended by Aristarchus, and holds that we may with safety draw the conclusion that the Antimachean text, differing from the vulgate to no greater degree than an indifferent MS differs from a good one, was approximately the same as that which was authoritative in the age of Pericles. While we would fain believe that the strength of the chain of evidence that makes for this conclusion has not been underestimated by us, we must take issue with our editor as regards the approximate certainty with which this pre-Euclidean text can be reproduced. The ultimate significance of Mr. Leaf's assertion that tradition, in preserving the name of Antimachus, has ensured our possessing a text upon which we may rely as the *vulgata* of the fifth century, may excuse a very brief discussion of a few arguments that serve to show that the practical possibility of establishing such a canon as the best tradition of the fifth century is far less than Mr. Leaf seems to imagine. These arguments, fortified by the results of some of the latest researches on the subject, deal with relations of Aristarchus to his sources, a problem bristling with difficulties, which in turn are enhanced by our ignorance of the exact position occupied by Didymus in regard to his sources. Recent research, in increasing our scepticism of the possibility of ever unveiling the mystery in which the pre-Aristarchean MSS are involved, has confirmed much that had been conjectured in a former period of Homeric investigation.

If Aristarchus actually made use of *ἡ κατὰ Ἀντίμαχον*, as is generally supposed, it can never be proved that he possessed the original MS. *Graecia mendax*, in supplying the ever-growing zeal of the Alexandrians for a complete collection of codices, may have passed off on the unsuspecting Samothracian MSS of an unblushing lack of authenticity. This is, however, an uncontrollable factor for us moderns. It is at least doubtful whether Aristarchus had any knowledge of so important a codex as the *ἡ ἐκ νάμθηκος* of Aristotle and of the *ἐκδοσις* of Euripides, which was in all probability pre-Euclidean. Of the date and character of the *Μασσαλιωτική*, of which it is probable that but one text existed, and of the *Χία*, of the *Ἀργολική*<sup>1</sup> (perhaps the work of *philologunculi*) we know practically nothing, though it is possible that they were included in Aristarchus' *apparatus criticus*. Ludwig's statement that Aristarchus himself was unable to date these MSS has not been supported by its author. The Königsberg scholar has, however, done no mean service in attempting to raise a bulwark of negative facts against that *gaukelndes Spiel ausschweifendster Phantasie* which seeks *de suo* to determine the original source of the older editions in the possession of Aristarchus. Equally vain as in the

<sup>1</sup> Römer (Die Homerrecension des Zenodot, 1885) well says that these MSS appear consecrated by the centuries to the innocent layman on first hearing their names. *Wie würde unsere heutige Philologie diese heiligen Urzeugen . . . ausgenützt haben?* (p. 24). The course of Homeric research has proved that the antiquity of these MSS is very doubtful; and with this doubt disappears our veneration for their authority. Aristarchus was no believer in these mysterious MSS, adopting but five or six out of the twenty-nine readings cited from the Massiliensis and none from the *Χία*. Some of the MSS Römer thinks may not be antecedent to Zenodotus.

case of the *Μασσαλιωτική* are the efforts to date any of the *κατὰ πόλεις* editions. Düntzer imagined himself able to pierce the obscurity surrounding the earlier editions, and was led to the conclusion: *von den Abschriften des wohl im Perserkriege untergegangenen Staatsexemplars waren die alexandrinischen Kritiker mittel- oder unmittelbar abhängig*. It would be difficult to find in the entire range of Homeric research an assertion less supported by facts than this. As well operate with the "edition of Pisistratus" as draw conclusions from so reckless a statement.

Vital to the correctness of Mr. Leaf's theory of the continuity of tradition is the assumption that the *κοινὰ ἐκδόσεις* represent a pre-Aristarchean vulgate, one text differing inconsiderably in its details from another, but bearing at least no trace of those vast textual revolutions undergone by the epos in the distant past. The *κοινὰ* are constantly contrasted by the scholia with the text of Aristarchus. But I have been able to discover no cogent argument in Ludwig's volume that demonstrates indisputably that they were older than *αἱ Ἀριστάρχου*. While even the actual significance of the term *κοινὰ* is a battleground of critics (Nitzsch, Kayser and others held views diametrically opposed to those of the Königsberg scholar), it cannot but seem to some uncritical to push to the extreme the evidence in favor of a pre-Aristarchean vulgate, especially when we claim to find its earliest representative in a text about which our knowledge is elusive, though Mr. Leaf holds it to be essentially identical with the Attic recension of the fifth century. Though personally we incline to the opinion that there existed both pre-Aristarchean and post-Aristarchean *κοινὰ*, yet no desire to elevate a mere probability into a possible reality can make us fail to see that there is but little warranty for regarding *ἡ Ἀντιμάχου* as its earliest traceable form. *Ἡ Ἀντιμάχου* is referred to in the scholia A 298, 424, 598, E 461,<sup>1</sup> N 60, Ψ 870, α 85 and its *quisquilæ* rejected by Aristarchus in the three latter instances. Is the logic of the philologist reduced to such a pass that it must confess itself so thoroughgoing an adherent of the *argumentum ex silentio* as to believe that the Antimachean edition varied from the *κοινή* in but such a trifling number of instances?<sup>2</sup>—even though Aristarchus is said to have adduced *variae lectiones* only when his critical sagacity impugned their value so far as to refuse them admission into his text. If we bind ourselves to this species of argumentation we may reproduce the text of the vulgate of the fifth century, but we reproduce it unconsciously. The citation of four passages of agreement between the edition of Antimachus and the *κοινή* no more affords an opportunity for critical combinations than the agreement of *ἡ Σινωπική* with *ἡ Ἀντιμάχου* on A 298, 424, E 461, or with *ἡ Ἀριστάρχειος* A 298, 424, 435, or its difference from the last named, B 258, permits us to form a conclusion as to the character of the entire text, even though we heap together all our little knowledge of the principles of Homeric criticism in the Ptolemaic age.<sup>3</sup> Will any one assert that we should be justified

<sup>1</sup> "Τρῶας" ἐν τῇ . . . Ἀντιμάχου. ἡ μέντοι κοινή . . . "Τρῶας."

<sup>2</sup> It is unfortunate that there is no citation from Theagenes of Rhegium in the scholia, otherwise Mr. Leaf might have carried his tradition back to the sixth century.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Römer (p. 12): *Wenn auch Aristarch über den wirklichen und vorliegenden Textbestand vollständig im Klaren, so war er über die Gründe, die seine Vorgänger zu Aenderungen, Athetesen, Interpolationen bestimmten fast vollständig im Dunkeln und musste dieselben meistens durch Combinationen zu eruiren suchen und hat da auch manchmal fehlgegriffen*. Cf. also Mr. Leaf *ad* E 249, 791, and Römer, p. 9.

in forming conclusions as to the value and position of the (uncollated) Venetus B, No. 453, if we possessed but seven citations from it? Possibilities without number present themselves to the critic desirous of founding a Periclean text, but it is safer to confess the limitations of our acquaintance with pre-Aristarchean tradition than to enshrine the edition of Choerilus' contemporary (whose birthplace, Clarus, does not presage much for his authoritativeness in reproducing an Attic vulgate) in the exalted position of being the earliest known form of the *κοινή*.

And again: though the fantastic conception of Aristarchus that Homer was an Athenian<sup>1</sup> may invalidate much of his authority as a conservative adherent of ancient tradition, it cannot be denied that thereby there is a greater probability that his text approaches the Attic text more closely than any of the *κατὰ πώλεις* editions, if we believe with Ritschl that the latter were *die Urschriften localer Textrecensionen*, an assumption that can neither be proved nor gainsaid. The critical labors of Aristarchus are assumed to have interrupted the current of *κοινή* tradition, as, to draw a parallel from another department of Greek life, the philosophical theories of Plato and Aristotle were but brilliant interruptions to the advance of those doctrines of the pre-Socratic philosophers which again came to the front in the speculation of the Epicurean and Stoic schools. But the critical activity of the successor of Aristophanes was not confined to the *conjecturalis emendatio*. It attempted, as Zenodotus, the godfather of the 'Ομηρικοί, had in vain attempted before him, to stem the current against a corrupt vulgate upon the basis of a critical apparatus which must have increased in authority after the period of Zenodotus. His MSS must have varied very considerably from the vulgate text, but of them we know practically nothing. If ἡ Ἀντιμάχειος had been equipollent to the Attic vulgate of the fifth century, and Aristarchus had possessed a good copy, we should expect to find at least a sporadic reference in the scholia to the value of such a venerable authority. But there is everywhere darkness visible on this point. Of all the grounds that seem worth the sober attention of the critic, I can see none that identifies the Antimachean edition with that of the vulgate; nor do I recollect to have seen any assertion by Ludwig, on whose researches Mr. Leaf bases his conclusions, that such was the case. When we have obtained the all-important information whence came the MSS in Aristarchus' apparatus, what was their date, etc., then we can cease dealing with *x*, *y* and *z*. Mr. Leaf (cf. p. xiv) intimates correctly enough that Aristarchus did not always know what the best tradition was, and that he occasionally rejected it, when known, from preconceived notions.<sup>2</sup> Hence, when Aristarchus departs from the best tradition of the fifth century Mr. Leaf must reject his readings. But his representative of this best tradition is a vulgate which keeps itself invisible in its tents only to appear victoriously on four occasions. If a successful restoration of the Aristarchean text is dependent upon no inconsiderable number of preliminary investigations in reference to the methods of Didymus, which even Ludwig has not solved without peradventure, how great must be the difficulties in the

<sup>1</sup> Hence the form *οὖν*, a form found in the Attic dialect alone.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Leaf frequently rejects the Aristarchean readings, e. g. Γ 368 MSS οὐδ' ἐβάλον μιν, A. οὐδὲ δάμασσα, on the ground that βάλλω was used only of a blow of a missile; Γ 352 MSS δάμασσον, A. δαμῆναι; Θ 526 Arist. εὐχομαι ἐλπίμενος, where Zenod. ἐλπ. εὐχ. is preferable, despite Römer's objections; I 509 MSS εὐχόμενιοι, A. εὐχομένιοι—the present part. means "boasting"; cf. also I 564, 602 *et pass.*



reproduction of a text antedating that of Aristarchus by almost three centuries! The highest aim of scholars of the traditional school is, then, to restore the text of Aristarchus, since it is impossible from the knowledge of pre-Aristarchean sources at our command to define the exact form of any text antecedent to that of the great Alexandrian.

In further confirmation of our inability to restore the Homer of Thucydides or even of Pindar, or (here another *motif* comes to light) "perhaps even a critically better text than any which in their uncritical time had been composed from the existing but scattered materials" (is Mr. Leaf a Paleyite?), may be cited the well-known argument drawn from the variations in the geographers and philosophers. The reasons for those of the geographers are self-evident; but when Mr. Leaf makes the sweeping statement that the variations in the classical authors are "seldom of importance," we think he has underestimated their value. In themselves these variants may not be of great significance, but the existence of no less than about forty variants in Plato and Aristotle each cannot be accounted for by the difference between the requirements of the ancient and the modern world in regard to the verbal accuracy of quotation. These variants show that there must have been other texts in existence besides an assumed *vulgata*; a conclusion that is not impugned by the fact that Didymus fails to make use of this material. Thucydides' citation of the Hymns is remarkable, and passages disappeared from the *vulgata* even before the second century B. C. (e. g. I 448-461).

The interesting question whether or no the Alexandrian savants possessed pre-Euclidean MSS, a most important factor in the problem of the restoration of a text of the fifth century, is unfortunately not referred to by our editor. If it is true<sup>1</sup> that the earliest notice which appears to preserve a trace of the existence of MSS in the *ἀρχαία συνθήχεια* (Aristonicus *ad* A 104: Ζηνόδοτος γράφει "ὅν ποτ' Ἀχιλλεύς." μήποτε δὲ πεπλάνηται, γεγραμμένον τοῦ ὁ ὑπ' ἀρχαίης σημασίας ἀντὶ τοῦ ὦ, προσθεῖς τὸ ὦ) is a mere conjecture, and that all other references (e. g. H 238, a 52, 254; cf. E 241) rest upon a foundation even more insecure, we can reject as undemonstrable the assertion of Cobet (*Misc. Crit.* 289) that Zenodotus transcribed *εἰς τὰ Ἰωνικὰ γράμματα* MSS written *γράμμασιν Ἀττικοῖς*. As the question needs a renewed ventilation I give a collection of passages involving the letters E and O, which serves to show that Aristarchus, and *a fortiori* Didymus, did not possess any MSS in the *παλαιὰ γραμματική*.<sup>2</sup>

#### I. H, not E.

1. A 298 *μαχήσομαι εἵνεκα κοῦρης*: οὕτως διὰ τοῦ η, οὐ διὰ τοῦ ες, καὶ ἡ *Μασσαλιωτική* καὶ ἡ Ἀργολική καὶ ἡ Σινωπική καὶ ἡ Ἀντιμάχου. In the MSS stood *ΜΑΧΗΣΟΜΑΙ*, not *ΜΑΧΕΣ(Σ)ΟΜΑΙ*. Cf. *Schol. ad* B 377.

2. A 381 *ἥεν*: *HEN* in ἡ *Κυπρία* and in ἡ *Κρητική*, which perhaps never came under the cognizance of Aristarchus, as it is mentioned by Seleucus alone on this passage.

3. Γ 10 *ἦντε ὄρευσ*, in the *Χία* and *Μασσ.* and in "certain others," is held by Mr. Leaf to be an error for *ἦντ' ὄρευσ*. All the other MSS with the exception of G have *εὔτε*, with which our editor well compares the uses of "as." The *schol.* have *διὰ τοῦ ε* αὐτὸν Ἀριστάρχου τὸ *εὔτε*. The *Χία* had *ΗΤΤΕ*, not *ΕΤΤΕ*.

<sup>1</sup> See Ludwig's *Aristarch's Homerische Textkritik*, p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> See Giese's *Der aolische Dialekt*, 1837, §14.

4. T 117 ὁ δ' ἑβδομος ἐσθῆκει μεις. ἐν τῇ Χίᾳ μῆς. Giese suggests that μῆς may be a dialectical form and not one reading of ΜΕΣ, the other being μεις.

5. B 258 ἡ δὲ Σινωπικὴ εἶχε "κιχῆσμαι."

6. Φ 11 ἐννεον: ἐναι τῶν κατὰ πόλεις "νήχοντ'."

7. Ω 82 κῆρα: "πῆμα" ἐναι τῶν κ. π. Cf. also schol. ad B 53, 415, Π 127.

II. EI, not E.

1. A 97 ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ἀπώσσει, not "ἀεκέα" ἡ Μασσ., etc.

2. A 585 ἐν χειρὶ τίθει, not "χερσί" ἡ Μ., etc.

3. Γ 51 κατηφείην, not κατηφείη (as Zenod.).

4. Σ 538 εἶμα δ' ἐχ': ἐν τῇ Μ. "εἰμά τ' ἐχε."

5. Τ 56 ἀμφοτέροισιν ἀρειον: ἐν τῇ Χίᾳ "ὄνειαρ," ἐγγράπτο, ἐν τῇ Μ. "ἀμεινον."

6. Τ 76 ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων: ἐν δὲ τῇ Μ. καὶ Χίᾳ "κρείων."

7. Ω 192 ἡ δὲ Μ. πολλὰ κεκεύθει. The schol. has been emended to οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος "κεχάνθει" διὰ τοῦ Ξι.

8. O 44 ἐν—καὶ Μ. καὶ Ἀργολικῇ οὕτως ἐφέρετο "κτεινομένους δ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν ἰδών."

9. Φ 86 ἀνάσσει: ἐναι τῶν κατὰ πόλεις "ἀνασσε."

III. HI, not EI.

1. I 639 ἐπὶ τῇσι: οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇσι "ἐν ἀπάσαις, ἐπὶ ταῖς Λεσβίσι." ἀπασαι διορθώσεις is an expression of the epitomists to signify both the two editions of Aristarchus and all others with which his agreed in any given case.

2. X 51 παιδὶ γέρων: αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων "παιδὶ φίλῃ."

3. X 93 μένησι: "δοκεύῃ" ἐναι τῶν κατὰ πόλεις.

4. O 18 μέμνη: διὰ τοῦ η εἶχον πᾶσαι. Cf. also K 346.

IV. Ω, not O.

1. A 97 ἀπώσσει: ἡ Μασσαλιωτικῇ.

2. Π 127 ἰωήν: ἐν τῇ Μ. "ἐρωήν."

3. N 60 κεκοπώς: ἐν δὲ τῇ Χίᾳ καὶ Ἀντιμάχου "κεκοπών."

4. Υ 188 βοῶν ἀπο: ἐν τῇ Χίᾳ "βοῶν ἐπι."

5. Τ 386 τῷ δ' εὐτε: ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων "τῶν δ' αὐτε."

6. Φ 454 τηλεπαπών: αἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων "θηλυτερών."

7. Υ 308 γένωνται: αἱ διὰ τῶν πόλεων "λίπωνται."

8. α 52 Ἀτλαντος θυγάτηρ ὀλοόφρωνος, ὅς τε θαλάσσης: . . . ἡ ἐγγράπτο κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν γραφὴν [ΟΛΟΟΦΡΟΝ, i. e. ὀλοόφρων], εἰτά τις μὴ νοήσας προσέθηκε τὸ ὄ. Schwierlich mehr als eine misslungene Conjectur: Ludwig. The ὅς of the relative clause was the cause of the difficulty. The grammarians merely used their knowledge of the existence of γράμματα Ἀττικά as a means of explaining forms which presented difficulties to them.<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Ω 30, Φ 88, Υ 62.

V. ΩΙ, not ΟΙ.

A 598 εἵνοχόει: οὕτως "οἶνοχόει" Ἀρίσταρχος, Ἰακῶς· καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀργολικῇ καὶ Μ. καὶ Ἀντιμαχεῖω κτλ.

VI. ΟΥ, not O.

1. Υ 62 ἐκ θρόνου ἄλτο: ἐν ἄλλῃ "ἐκ θρόνου ὄρτο." οὕτως καὶ ἡ Μ.

2. Ω 109 ὀτρύνεσκον: ἡ Μ. "ὀτρύνουσιν." οὕτως καὶ ἡ Χίᾳ.

3. B 53 βουλῇν: αἱ πλείους καὶ χαριέσταται "βουλῇ." Cf. also B 347.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. § 204 Κάστωρ: Καλλίστρατος ἐν τῇ ἐκ Μουσείου "Καστῶρ" φησὶ γεγράφθαι may record the existence of a var. lect. (Ἄκτωρ? or Κάτωρ?) and need not have been caused by ΑΣΤΩΡ. The interchange in the MSS of ο and ω (e. g. 10 times in A, 27 times in B) cannot be held as an argument for the influence of a pre-Euclidean alphabet.

Lastly, it should be mentioned that there was no sign for the spiritus asper in these MSS, H representing  $\eta$ . Both ' and the accents were introduced by the Alexandrians. The *koinai* MSS too show no trace of confusion between  $\epsilon$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\epsilon$  and  $\sigma\upsilon$ ,  $\omega$ ,  $\sigma\iota$ .

All these readings containing  $\epsilon$ ,  $\sigma\upsilon$ ,  $\omega$ ,  $\eta$ , cited from the MSS, came down to Didymus through the medium of copies. While, therefore, the proof of our position is perhaps in some instances difficult, there is no inconsiderable amount of testimony in the above citations which shows the Alexandrians not to have possessed pre-Euclidean MSS.

We have already seen that our knowledge of Antimachus' edition is too unsatisfactory to regard it as the forerunner of a long series of *vulgata* texts. The above collection of passages shows that there is an element of uncertainty in any attempt to restore a reading of the fifth century, since our supposed vulgate, even if emended by Aristarchus, was ultimately based upon MSS which may have contained false transcriptions of E and O sounds (cf. B 300 and schol.). We cannot, therefore, determine absolutely whether the Attic text of the fifth century had  $\mu\alpha\chi\eta\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  or  $\mu\alpha\chi\tau\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  A 298. Heracleon wrote the latter. We are gratified to see that Mr. Leaf writes  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\eta\rho\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$  K 97,  $\beta\eta\omega$  Z 113; why not then  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\chi\eta\alpha\tau\omicron$  M 179, when on the one hand we have  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\chi\eta\mu\alpha\iota$ , and on the other the possibility that it is incorrectly transcribed with  $\epsilon\iota$  instead of  $\eta$  from AKEXEATO? Why then not write  $\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  A 23, since  $\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  cannot be original and was not the genuine reading of the fifth century? Christ's arguments are not sufficiently cogent to justify a Hellenic subj. in  $-\omega$ : we read, therefore,  $\delta\alpha\mu\eta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  H 72, where all MSS have  $\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ . Mr. Leaf has  $\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  here, but  $\delta\alpha\mu\eta\eta\varsigma$  Γ 436. We find that our editor reads  $\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$  Γ 441 despite  $\tau\alpha\rho\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ . He confesses his adherence to the old and questionable etymology of  $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\chi\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$  from  $\delta\epsilon\iota\kappa\nu\omicron\mu\iota$ , and does not even mention the plausible proposition of Leo Meyer to refer it to  $\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\alpha\tau\iota$  and write with  $\eta$ . I can see no reason for an intensive formation here. I regard the explanation of  $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  given on I 196 from  $\delta\epsilon\iota\text{-}\delta\iota\kappa\text{-}\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  as incorrect. There are no genuine instances of a reduplicating syllable  $\epsilon\iota$  in the perfect. 'Αδελφεός, δο, ἡγγετο (H 434) have been relegated to the notes because the "traditional reading is not, on the face of it, unmetrical, as in the case of 'Ιφίτου B 518, 'Ασκληπίου B 731." We respect Mr. Leaf's scrupulous conscience, but wish that the mere fact that  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\epsilon\iota\upsilon$  is metrical had not deterred him from adopting Ahrens' conjecture, especially as  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  occurs thirteen times. The same veneration for the *littera scripta* has perpetuated the life of  $\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , a *peccatum ab origine*, on the analogy of the "traditional"  $\tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , a form as unjustifiable as  $\delta\pi\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  T 172. Granting an editor of the Iliad all the conservatism he demands in rejecting etymologies which savor of excessive boldness (though Mr. Leaf's identification (Z 321) of  $\epsilon\pi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$  and  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\omega$  through  $sa$  and  $sa + m$  ( $sm$ ) will not strike a modern etymologist as being dictated by great caution), it is difficult to agree with his position, when, with the possibility of false transcription staring him in the face, he nevertheless prefers bad, nay impossible Greek to good Greek because the former has been anointed by the unction of "tradition." Not even "Old John Naps of Greece" ever beheld such forms as are constantly embalmed in our editions of Homer. But Mr. Leaf's adherence to tradition is, however, not unlikely to win the favor of all

except those whose bolder aim seeks to rid a long-suffering text from the ignorance of luckless wights of transcribers. In B 617 Mr. Leaf has even failed to follow "tradition." He should have read 'Ἀλῆσιον, the epichoristic name as attested by an Elean inscription and by Eustathius *ad loc.* and by Steph. Byz. *ad* A 757 (where Mr. L. and Rzach 'Ἀλεισίον, La R. 'Ἀλίσιον). If the dangers of incorrect transcription are not sufficient to deter an editor from his reproduction of non-Hellenic forms, the wavering orthography of the time of Aristarchus, not to speak of that of Didymus, might have been effective. A glance at Schaefer's Gregorius Corinthus or the second edition of Blass' *Aussprache des Griechischen* ought to remove the scruples even of the most scrupulous.

A difference from the ordinary text claimed by Mr. Leaf for his edition is his reproduction of the diaeresized form in Πηλείδης. He, however, writes 'Ἀργεῖος and everywhere *ēi* in the middle of a word except in the patronymics. This is correct, as I have shown in my treatise (Der Diphthong EI) that there was a gradual demise of *ēi* from *ēoi*. The editors of the tragedians do not follow the same rule in the case of the patronymics. Πηλείδης is not necessary, but facilitates the flow of the dactylic rhythm. Cf. Agam. 123, Antig. 982, Med. 824 and Menrad *De contractionis et syniuseos usu Hom.*, 1886, p. 64.

ἐπεραῖε A 297, νηλέε E 330, show that Mr. Leaf is of the opinion that the διάσπασις in the dat. loc. in the Hom. text held good to the Peloponnesian war. In the above-cited paper (p. 25 *seqq.*) I have shown that even in the melic and iambographic poets the majority of forms refuse to admit the open form in this case; and in Attic it is extremely rare, if occurring at all, from -εσ stems. εἰπέει πόντιον Trach. 114, an -εσ stem, is an epic reminiscence. How does Mr. Leaf propose to prove that in the Homer of Thucydides *ēi* was read in the dative? Certainly his MS authority does not support his readings in any great number of instances (cf. La Roche's Textkritik for the signification of the two dots placed over the *ι* of *ei* in the MSS), and the balance of probability inclines us to the belief that the number of spondaic verses was greater in the fifth than in any preceding century.

The limits set to this review preclude the possibility of any discussion of the conclusions which our editor has reached in his examination of the structure and history of the Homeric poems. It may, however, be stated that he athetizes in the text but 63 lines in A-M. There remains then the pleasant duty of offering to him our congratulations upon the character of his editorial work, which he has performed so felicitously as to entitle him to the gratitude of all Homeric scholars. If in the preceding portion of this review we have had occasion to cast some doubts upon the degree of probability to be attained in restoring even approximately a pre-Euclidean text, and to demand the exercise of greater caution in dealing with the sources of information at our command, our dissent on that point must only serve to emphasize our cordial appreciation of his every page, from which we have drawn no little instruction. Mr. Leaf is too much a believer that *le moi est haïssable*, except where he refers to his work in the Journ. Hellen. Studies. Content to leave unspecified whatever improvements may have been the result of his own acumen, his edition testifies to a more extended acquaintance with recent German criticism than we are wont to find among English scholars; and the *naïveté* which



prompted the remark of an English editor of the Iliad—that he had read Wolf's *Prolegomena*—finds no place in a book which bears evidence of painstaking individual work and general sobriety of judgment.

The devotion of this edition to the guidance of tradition has prevented Mr. Leaf from yielding to the allurements of the *divina ars coniectandi*, which are, perhaps, more seductive in the case of Homer than in that of any other classic. If we may hazard a conjecture, our editor is more sympathetically inclined to the rigorous grammatical criticism of the Dutch than to the brilliant fertility of the St. Petersburg school, whose estimation of the lucubrations of Aristarchus as *ineptiae* severs it from English methods of Homeric criticism by a wide chasm. In citing the readings of Zenodotus we miss any attempt to explain the cause of the variants. Mr. Leaf has relegated to the notes all emendations of the text (except those mentioned on page 7). These consist of attempts to restore *F* (the two-edged sword of criticism) and, rarely, more exact grammatical construction (e. g. A 125, with Mr. Monro, ἀλλά θ' ἂ μὲν). No effort is made at a complete restoration of the *F*, and obvious conjectures are frequently passed by, e. g. Γ 351 ὁ με πρότερος κάκ' ἔρεξε. When a conjecture like Nauck's ἀκλεές (M 318) appears to have some support in tradition (ἀκλεές δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος κατὰ συγκοπήν), Mr. Leaf does not hesitate to adopt a form which comparative grammar proves to have been original. Such occurrences are, however, rare.

In comparison with editions such as those of Nauck, Fick, Christ, Rzach, which aim at purifying the text of linguistic *horrenda*, or even at reconstructing an original Homer, Mr. Leaf's text has a humbler aspiration. It represents no essential advance upon the text of the school-edition of Ameis-Hentze, and, measured by the radical tendencies in Homeric criticism which have undoubtedly gained ground since the appearance of Nauck's recension, marks a positive retrogression. Thus Mr. Leaf will not even remove the ν ἐφελκυστικόν in ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἕκαστος because he has no MS "authority, which, however unconsciously, retains the tradition of a lost *F*," though, from love of the ictus-theory of Fick, he justifies (on E 293) the Göttingen professor's bolder procedure in expelling the parasitic letter. Nor will he attempt to restore -οισι, e. g. in Γ 331 ἀργυρέοισιν ἐπισφύριους ἀραρνίας, though we cannot be sure that -οισι was not the older termination or that -οισι was not felt as the ending by the Athenians of the fifth century, who preserved it till Ol. 86, 3 (though, perhaps, as a form savoring of legal phraseology, as in the latest example Ol. 83, 4 Ἀθηναίοισι, CIA IV 25). Mr. Leaf can, however, comfort himself with the thought that he has manuscript testimony in his favor, despite the fact that the writer has himself materially reduced the number of cases of the occurrence of -οις in Homer below that to which they were emended by Nauck in the third volume of the *Mél. gr.-rom.*

But even if the edition before us offer no advance upon the traditional text, which has proved an eyesore to a generation of scholars trained to new conceptions of the dignity of Homeric research, it has its obvious justification. As well grant a Scotchman his premises and then dispute the correctness of his logic, as differ with an editor of Homer who does not adopt readings which, at the outset, were not in harmony with the plan of his text. Mr. Leaf has done sufficient service to the cause of Homeric scholarship if he alone confines his labors to the successful explanation of a vulgate text.

It will be impossible here to extend to Mr. Leaf's edition that richly merited courtesy of an expression of opinion in reference both to the many points of interpretation in which we have taken the liberty of differing from him, and to those felicitous explanations of crucial passages in which his volume abounds. A cursory examination of some few passages in  $\Gamma$  must suffice in place of a thoroughgoing treatment of all.

$\Gamma$  18. Mr. Leaf writes  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}\rho$   $\delta$  against the authority of the critics of antiquity, and quotes Didymus to show that Homer frequently employs phrases like  $\delta$   $\delta\epsilon$ , etc., without any change of subject. I cannot accept A 191 as an "appropriate instance."  $\eta$   $\delta$   $\gamma\epsilon$   $\phi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\gamma\alpha\nu\omicron\nu$   $\delta\epsilon\zeta\upsilon$   $\epsilon\rho\nu\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$   $\pi\alpha\rho\grave{\alpha}$   $\mu\eta\rho\upsilon$  |  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$   $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$ ,  $\delta$   $\delta'$   $\Lambda\tau\rho\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma\omicron\iota$  contains a well-defined contrast with  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$   $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ . Cf. also  $\nu$  219. In our passage there is neither any such contrast nor is there any special emphasis laid upon the subject as in A 191.

$\Gamma$  22.  $\beta\iota\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$  is read by Mr. L.: "omni caret librorum auctoritate," La Roche.  $\beta\iota\beta\acute{\omega}\nu\tau\alpha$  is therefore the correct reading here (so G. Curtius).  $\beta\iota\beta\eta\mu\iota$  passed over to  $\beta\iota\beta\acute{\alpha}\omega$ .

$\Gamma$  23. The explanation of  $\pi\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\nu}\alpha\omega\nu$ , in which Mr. Leaf coincides with Nägelsbach, is well adapted to the character of  $\Gamma$ , which might be called the *Book of Revenge*.

$\Gamma$  26. Since both of the two etymologies quoted for  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\zeta\eta\omicron\iota$  (abhi-jāva,  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota + \zeta\eta$ ) contradict the laws of comparative philology, they should have been omitted.

$\Gamma$  54. The significant absence of the deictic article before  $\kappa\acute{\iota}\theta\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$  might well have been noticed.

$\Gamma$  57.  $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\omicron\nu$   $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omicron$ : A case of neglected  $F$  according to Mr. L. But  $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\omicron\nu$  is permissible, as  $\alpha\iota$  from  $\alpha F\iota$  is Homeric as well as  $\alpha\acute{\iota}$  (cf.  $\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ,  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$ ). MS authority avails little here. Read either  $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\omicron\nu$   $F\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron$  or  $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\omicron\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}F\epsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron$ , of which a trace may perhaps be seen in  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omicron$  in the MSS. It may be remarked in passing that, so far as I remember, I have found no reference in Mr. Leaf's book to the theory of Hartel (whose *Studien* are mentioned twice in the notes on  $\Delta$  and once in those on  $E$ ) in reference to the vocalization of  $F$ , which would clear up such *unica* as  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\eta\beta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omega$  A 438,  $\delta\nu$  609,  $\omicron\iota$  E 338, the "only line in the Iliad in which there is no easy emendation which will restore  $F$  to  $\omicron\iota$ "; cf. Z 90. Mr. Leaf does not mention the absence of  $F$  in  $\text{'H}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ .

$\Gamma$  318  $\lambda\alpha\omicron\iota$   $\delta'$   $\acute{\eta}\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$ ,  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma\iota$   $\delta\epsilon$   $\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\sigma\chi\omicron\nu$ . Though the reason adduced in favor of Nicanor's reading ( $\acute{\eta}\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$   $\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$   $\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon$   $\chi$ .  $\acute{\alpha}$ .) may be "frivolous," there is an argument in its favor which has been overlooked by Mr. L. If a verb of prayer ( $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  or  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ) is joined with  $\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  the dative (the god) belongs with the verb of prayer, e. g. T 254.  $\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  governs the dative only when there is no verb like  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  in the sentence, e. g. Z 257. See Ameis-Hentze.

$\Gamma$  334. Mr. L. might have noticed that  $\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma\alpha\nu\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu = \theta\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$  of Zenodotus' reading is un-Homeric.  $\theta\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ . is used of the aegis alone.

$\Gamma$  348. "H. always uses  $\chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  of weapons of offence, not of the shield," i. e. in case  $\chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  is used *by itself*.

$\Gamma$  367. I think Mr. Leaf will find it difficult to discover any trace of a  $\gamma$   $F\alpha\gamma\gamma$  which shall explain  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\nu$ . There is no evidence whatsoever for such a root in Greek or in any cognate language, so far as I remember. It is at least safer, if not entirely satisfactory, to explain  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\nu$  from  $*\acute{\eta}\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\nu$ ; cf.  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu$  from

\*ῥᾶλον, βασιλῆα from βασιλέα. Mr. Leaf himself seems to accept the explanation of ῥα from ῥᾶ (cf. Δ 321), which is perhaps different from ῥᾶγην. On E 487 Mr. Leaf holds that ῥαλον is a case of double augment.

As Lange and Monro (the latter to too great an extent) are made responsible for no inconsiderable portion of the notes on syntax, though it should be stated that Mr. Leaf aims to take truth for authority and not authority for truth, we deem it best to limit our criticism to that portion of his volume in which he has not achieved equal success, especially as an anticipatory notice (A. J. P. VII 271) has already referred to several syntactical inaccuracies.

Though it may seem unreasonable to demand of an editor of the Iliad so intimate an acquaintance with those contemporary views of I.-E. vocalization which have upset the authority of Curtius, as to avoid speaking of a root *var* A 356, *man* B 484, or of *ishirds* for *isaras* A 366 (see Osthoff, M. U. IV 151), etc., we feel that it is surely no injustice to expect that his etymological horizon should not be practically restricted to that of Curtius. In the department of etymology the English seem to be *laudatores unius hominis*: him they enthrone for a generation until another luminary appear. The appearance of the second English edition of Curtius' *Grundzüge* is destined to retard, by a decennium at least, the dissemination of many true conceptions of Greek morphological laws. This defect in Mr. Leaf's book is not remedied by sporadic references to Schmidt, Wackernagel, or by the citation of Buttmann, valuable, says Mr. Monro, for his "method," or of Döderlein; and still less will any reference to Göbel (twice quoted on p. 149) counterbalance this defect. The writer remembers to have heard the *Althochmeister* himself stigmatize Göbel's volumes as arrogant in their claim of being a continuation of the great *Lexilogus* of Buttmann. Göbel, as everybody knows, is the *bête noire* of every authoritative etymologist.

Inasmuch then as Mr. Leaf's otherwise so admirable work displays no little fondness for outworn conceptions of phonetic law, I think to render best service as a critic by attaching greater prominence to this subject, and beg his kind consideration of some few suggestions that may perhaps be of avail for a second edition; and I have inserted several conjectures of my own as to the formation of certain Homeric words.

A 18: "For *θεῖος* we ought probably always to read *θείος*, as the word is always found with the last syllable *in arsi*." *θεῖος* occurs about 75 times in the Iliad and Odyssey, and *θείος* can be read everywhere except 13 times before *αἰδώς* in the fifth foot (e. g. α 336, δ 17, θ 47), once (in the second foot) ψ 133, and once before *δνειρος* B 22, where *ούλος* is, however, a v. l. Mr. Leaf should have alluded to the substitution of *δίος* for *θεῖος* in his note on B 22 (not B 422, as in Lex. Hom., where other misprints are π 152 (i. e. 252) and σ 116). Causer and others object strenuously to Nauck's substitution of *δίος*.

A 52: "πυκ (in *ἐχεπενυκής*) is apparently another form of *πικ*; cf. *πενκεθανός* by *πικρός*." No such interrelation of radical *ι* and *υ* is accepted at present. *πικρός* belongs to *ποικίλος*, Skt. *péças*, Lat. *pingo*, *piget*; \**πενυκες* in *ἐχεπενυκής* contains the "strong" root form *πενυκ*, which appears in the weak *pug* in Lat. *pungo*.

A 129: *δῶσι* is said to be formed by epenthesis from *δῶσι*, the reading of Zoilus. The reference to Curtius' *Verbum* is the only support that is adduced

for this explanation, which is now antiquated. We are as yet uncertain of the actual termination of the 3. s. subj., and whether the *subscriptum* of -ω, -η is from -ωτι, -ωσι, or added to -ωτ from analogy. If σι was added to δῶ, then δῶσι is a development of δῶ, as ἐθέλῃσι from ἐθέλη. See Brugmann, M. U. I. 179 foll., with whom I cannot, however, agree when he regards the epigraphic forms in -η as = ητ.

A 526: "παλινάγρετον from ἀγρέω, which is said to be the Aiolic form of αἰρέω." In another note Mr. Leaf says ἀγρει and ἀγε are probably connected, in which statement he agrees with Anec. Ox. I 117, 27: ἀγε, ὅπερ οἱ Διολεῖς ἀγει φασι καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ρ ἀγρει. There is a good deal of confusion here. In the first place, ἀγε can have nothing to do with ἀγρει and ἀγει cannot have become ἀγρει by any πλεονασμός. We have ἀγρέω in the signification of αἰρέω at least four times on Aiolic inscriptions and twice in Sappho. As I do not see that any doubt can be cast upon their connection, I venture to propose the following means of explaining the two forms:

\*ἀ-γῖρέω  
αἰρέω Attic.      ἀγρέω, ἀγρημι Aiol.  
αἰλέω Cretan.

For *ι* as weak vowel cf. the Attic οἰκτῖρω (not οἰκτεῖρω) from \*οἰκτῖρ-γῶ with the *schwa* form in οἰκτρός. ἀ- is the prosthetic vowel to compensate for the weakened root. The spiritus asper in αἰρέω is from analogy to ἐλεῖν (Feleîn or ἐ-Fléiv), and the loss of intervocalic γ needs no special proof (e. g. post-Aristotelian ἀγρόχα, Boeot. ἀγείοχα, Tarent. ὀλίος = ὀλίγος, Boeot. ἰών). If ἀγε for ἀγε really existed it may be = ἀγη < ἀγημι. The form looks like a figment of the grammarians, who wished to secure a basis for their explanation of ἀγρει.

B 2. An orange for a norange is cited as a parallel for νήδυμος, a vox nihili from -ν ἡδύμος. Cannot our English orange be the representative of Old French *orange* (later *orange*), Ital. *arancia*, the *n* of which has perhaps been dropped through the influence of *aurum*, as Mr. Skeat suggests?

B 308. If Göbel's etymology of φοινός (φοF-ινος) were correct, we might expect at least a sporadic φοῖνός in Homer. I take this occasion of offering an explanation of the troublesome phrase φόνος αἵματος, e. g. II 162 ἐρευνγομενοι φόνον αἵματος. The Lex. Hom. remarks, with appropriateness, that this is *mire dictum*, especially since the translation *Mordblut* (durch Mord vergossenes Blut), *blutiger Mord* prevails in Germany. If we notice an unusual signification of the Skt. ghaná (γghven, as in φόνος, θείνω) as "mass," e. g. saindhavaghaná Çat. Br., we have a complete parallel between φόνος and ghaná, and traces of an I.-E. conception.<sup>1</sup>

B 316. I do not see how ἀμφιαχῦαν and δίζημαι, γῆν, ζῆ, can be regarded as perfects with the reduplicating vowel *ι*, which belongs *par excellence* to the present. ἀμφιαχῦαν is without perfect reduplication. ΦιFάχω is reduplicated in the present, γFāχ.

<sup>1</sup> I subjoin an attempt to explain the difficult word οὐρούς "the launching-ways," a ἀραξ εἰρ. in Homer (B 153), which cannot, despite Mr. Leaf, be connected with ὀρύσσω, the root of which is ῥυκ. The shifting of the accentuation of the ground-form Fép-ος to Fep-ός (γFep in Fepνω) necessitated the expulsion of *ε*, and by compensatory prosthesis we obtain δ-Fp-ος, οὐρός. [Or the *ο* may be regarded as = Lesb. ὄν; for the loss of the nasal cf. ἀνέμωσαν A 459.] This is better than the assumption of a mutation-form \*FopFos (from Fepv-) \*Foppes, Foupós.



B 413. "πρίν from the comparative of *προ, προ-ιν*," savors too much of an apodictic statement, since the Gortynian form *πρίν* (VII 40) has not yet been explained.

Δ 138. A reference to Wackernagel's remarks on *είσατο* (*Bess. Beiträge* IV) might well have been inserted here.

Δ 155. The assertion that *F* can pass into *φ* ought to be more guardedly expressed than Mr. Leaf has done here on *φίλος < σφε-ιλος* (which is very doubtful), and on B 144 in reference to *φῆ < Fη* (instrumental of *σφο-*).

Δ 315. Wheeler (Nominal Accent, p. 64) reads *ὁμῶς*, since it belongs in that class of adjectives which end —υ and throw the accent on the penult.

Δ 483: "*εἰαμένη* 'lowland,' apparently from root *ās* (*sic!*) *ἤς*, to sit, for *ἡσάμένη*." If Mr. Leaf does not understand *εἰαμένη* to be = *ἡαμένη* by an incorrect transcription of *EAMENEI* (which he does not imply), it would have been instructive had he explained the diphthong of the former form.

Δ 515. On *Τρίτογένεια* cf. Osthoff, M. V. IV 195.

E 5. I cannot regard as tenable the assertion of Mr. Leaf that the *-ινος* of *ὀπαρινός* is to be compared with the *-εινος* of *ποθεινός* and with the *-εννος* of *ἀργεννός* (Aiol.) rather than with the *-ινος* of *φῆγινος*, etc. The fact that no such instance of the reduction of *ει* to *ι* occurs in Homer (as I have attempted to prove in my paper on *EI* and *Ī* in Homer, *Am. Journ. Philol.* VI) surely ought to outweigh the difference of accent, since it can be proved that a shifting of the accent to and from *-ος* occurred in no inconsiderable number of cases.

E 194. The unusual contraction in *πρωτοπαγείς* should have been noticed; *ζαχρηείς* M 347 also is not referred to. The first instance is in so far different from *ἐναργείς* η 201, Y 131, and *ἐπιδευείς* I 225 (Arist. *ἐπιδέβει*), as *πρωτοπαγείς* would not suit the verse; cf. *πρεσβυγενείς* Tyrtaeus IV 5. *πρηνείς* for *πρηνέες* A 179 is rightly athetized by Mr. Leaf.

E 487. Fick conjectured *ἑάλλοντε*, i. e. Aiolic for *ἑάλφοντε*; cf. Goth. *vilvan*.

Z 422. That there was a genuine Hellenic inflection *ιος, ια*, is proved by Homeric, Cretan (Gortynian Inscription VII 23) *ιῶ*, and by Homeric, Lesbian and Thessalian *ια*. There is no reason for considering *ιῶ* an analogical formation, since *ια* is not = *μία*, an etymology which Mr. Leaf ought to have considered more than "very doubtful." Cf. *οἶνη*, *oinos*, *aēva*, strong forms.

Z 507. *θεῖω* is for \**θέεω*, as asserted by Mr. Leaf (and I believe by Curtius), since a diphthong *eu* in Aiolic formed by *eF* loses the vocalic element in other dialects, e. g. *πνεύω* *ρέω* in Aiolic = *πνέω* *ρέω* in Doric and Ionic. *νέω* is both Aiolic and Doro-Ionic, hence it must be for *νευ-ju*, yod serving as a protector of the genuine diphthong; if not, then *νέω* is from *νεβω* by analogy.

Θ 43. *ὕν*, which Mr. Leaf calls the Cyprian form for *ὄν* (cf. *ὑγγεμος*· *συλλαβή* Hesychius), is, without question, for *ὄν* = *ἀνά*; cf. *ὑνέθηκε* Collitz 45, 3 Cyprus and *-τυ* for *-το* in *ἐνφρητάστυ* Dali. 4. Whether Hesychius held that the *ὕν*-of *ὑγγεμος* was = *ὄν*, or whether *ἀνά* + *γγεμ* in the Cyprian dialect was the equivalent of *ὄν* + *γλαβ* in Attic, is immaterial: that the sibilant of *ὄν* should become either the spiritus asper or lenis is utterly impossible. *σίαλος* is for \**σφίαλος*, otherwise \**ιαλος* (cf. note on I 208); *ὕς* is not from *ὄς*, as many still suppose, but represents a leveling of the case forms:

Nom. *sūs* = *ὕς*,  
Gen. *suós* = \**σφός*, \**σσός*,

whence  $\dot{\upsilon}\varsigma$ ,  $\dot{\upsilon}\delta\varsigma$  and  $\sigma\dot{\upsilon}\varsigma$ ,  $\sigma\upsilon\delta\varsigma$ . Cf. G. Meyer, Gram.<sup>2</sup> p. 221, and Osthoff, M. U. IV 356.

I 203.  $\zeta\omega\rho\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  is generally explained as Martial translates it, "misceri iussit amicis Largius Aeacides *vividiusque* merum"; that is to say, as if from the root  $\zeta\eta$ . Mr. Leaf is not content with this etymology, and suggests  $\chi\zeta\epsilon\varsigma$  "to boil." But how does he propose to reach a base  $\zeta\omega$  ( $\zeta\omega\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ , Ion.  $\zeta\acute{\omega}\omega$ ,  $\zeta\acute{\omega}\theta\iota$ ) from  $-\zeta\epsilon\varsigma$ ?

I 230: " $\delta\omicron\iota\acute{\eta}$  ( $\acute{\alpha}\pi.$   $\lambda\epsilon\gamma.$ ) = doubt, for  $\delta F\acute{\iota}\eta$  ( $dva$  = two; cf. *dubius* *Zwei-fel*)." Many signs and wonders happened in the classical world, but to believe that  $\delta\omicron\iota\acute{\eta}$  is from  $\delta F\acute{\iota}\eta$  demands too great credulity on the part of the reader.  $\delta\omicron\iota\delta\varsigma$  is =  $*\delta F\omicron\iota\delta\varsigma$ , and  $F$  cannot become  $\omicron$ .

I 319.  $F\iota\alpha$  is = Skt. *iva* by the not unusual metathesis of  $F$ . This is a most improbable etymology, supported by a reckless contradiction of phonetic law. We should like to see several certain cases of the metathesis of intervocalic  $F$ .

K 462:  $\tau\omicron\iota\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  (*sic*, and not  $\tau\omicron\iota\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ ) is neither so "obscure" a form, nor is the Alcaian  $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\delta\epsilon\omega\nu$  necessarily an "imitation" of the Homeric  $\tau\omicron\iota\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ . These are genuine Aiolic forms, the  $-\delta\epsilon$  part being inflected as  $-ve$  in  $\tau\omicron\iota\nu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$  Collitz, D. I. 345, 15,  $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\nu\epsilon\omicron\nu$  345, 17 in the Thessalian dialect,  $-ve$  being equipollent to  $-\delta\epsilon$ ; cf.  $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon$ ,  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon$ . That  $\tau\omicron\iota\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  is an Aiolic form is the more probable, since  $-\omicron\iota\varsigma$ , with but a very few MS exceptions, is the dat.-loc. ending of the article alone in the Aiolic dialect, and  $-\omicron\iota\varsigma\iota$  the Aiolic substantival and adjectival termination.

K 466. Is it not an inversion of the facts, as regards Greek grammar at least, to speak of  $\delta\epsilon F$  (in  $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\omega$ ) as the *lengthened* form of the root  $\delta\epsilon$ ?

$\Delta$  184: " $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\eta}$ , a lengthened form of  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\pi\acute{\eta}$ ," is not an incorrect, though a jejune statement. If we compare Hom.  $\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\eta}$   $\Delta$  66, Cyprian  $\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\alpha}$  (Hesychius  $\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\alpha}$ ) with  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\pi\acute{\eta}$  and  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\eta}$ , it is evident that we have here a case of anaptyxis. The forms with  $\omicron$  are probably Aiolic.

$\Delta$  201: "The  $\nu$  of  $\tau\epsilon\iota\nu$  seems to represent the  $m$  of I.-E *túbhyam*, the  $\delta h$  being dropped" (!). We hope Mr. Leaf will excuse our seeming *brutalité*, but this is a statement savoring of the days of Benfey or of Pott's youth, and completely at variance with the fixed laws of comparative grammar.

$\Delta$  697. I have attempted, in VI 436 of the Am. Journ. of Phil., to explain the seemingly anomalous  $\epsilon$  of  $\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\iota$  ( $\Delta$  205) *in thesi*, and to refute the arguments of Hartel, whose opinion that  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\acute{\iota}$  ( $\Delta$  86) contains a trace of the primitive quantity of the dative is shared by Mr. Monro and by Mr. Leaf. (See the latter's note on  $\Delta$  86.)

M 208. The scansion of  $\delta\phi\iota\nu$  as a trochee at the end of the verse is ascribed by Mr. Leaf to the power of the ictus alone. We find, however, a number of examples in prose ( $\Pi\acute{\iota}\rho\theta\omicron\varsigma$  CIA III 1012, and  $\Pi\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\kappa\chi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  Hesych.,  $\delta\epsilon\delta\acute{o}\kappa\chi\theta\alpha\iota$  Cauer<sup>2</sup> 510, 26) which represent the transitional stage between the aspirated *tenuis* and the spirant. If  $\acute{\omicron}\phi\iota\varsigma$  is therefore =  $\delta\phi\iota\varsigma$ , to the pronunciation at the time of the composition of this line, rather than to the ictus, is to be ascribed a quantity that might, it is true, be explained by the ictus alone. We are glad to note that Mr. Leaf is a believer in the traditional theory of ictus-lengthening (see his notes on E 31, 203, 293,  $\Gamma$  240, K 280, 285), though he nowhere defines his exact position in regard to this mooted question. When,

as in the case of ῥῆσις, another explanation may serve to account for an apparent metrical irregularity, is it not better to have recourse to it than to increase the number of cases of a metrical phenomenon that must at best have been regarded in the light of a license? Since Mr. Leaf has gone so far as to suggest that σπείω (for σπέω) in K 285 is a bold case of lengthening by the ictus, I am surprised that a similar explanation did not suggest itself to him in writing the note on H 340, a passage famous for its difficulty:

ἐν δ' αὐτοῖσι πύλας ποιήσομεν εὐ ἀραρνίας,  
ὄφρα δὲ αὐτῶν ἱππηλασίη ὁδὸς εἴη.

The MSS have εἴη, G. Hermann εἰη. A certain case of this form of the subjunctive of εἰμί is said to occur in Ψ 47, ὄφρα ζωοῖσι μετεῖω, and "possible" instances are I 245 ἡμῖν δὲ δὴ αἰσιμον εἴη, Σ 88 ἵνα καὶ σοὶ πένθος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μυρίον εἴη, ρ 586 ὥς περ ἂν εἴη. Mr. Leaf is quite correct in stating that εἴη cannot be formed from √έσ unless we hold to Christ's as yet unaccepted suggestion that there is a subj. termination -ω corresponding to Doric futures like κρηψίω and to the Skt. future. G. Meyer, Gramm.<sup>3</sup> §583, declares the diphthong of μετεῖω to be *unerklärlich*. In my treatise on the Diphthong EI I hazarded the conjecture that we have here simply a case of the ictus-lengthening of μετέω, which actually occurs, X 388, ζωοῖσιν μετέω, or perhaps an incorrect transcription of METEO by some one who did not know that occasionally this license of the lengthening of an antevocalic vowel was permitted. A genuine *ei* this cannot be. Other possible examples of this lengthening are μαχελομενος ρ 471, ἀκείθμενον, and perhaps κυκεῖω (and the ἀπαξ λεγ. Θρήϊκες?).

M 337. G. Meyer appears to have abandoned his explanation of βόσσαντι from βοF + σαντι and to have accepted the unusual contraction; cf. Gramm.<sup>3</sup> §141.

This edition is a beautiful example of the printer's art, and is singularly free from typographical errors. Should the note on A 26 not have contained a reference to H 340 rather than to H 439, and is not λαίβων Γ 57 (not in La R.) a misprint?

We beg leave to record our opinion that Mr. Leaf's edition is a most substantial addition to English scholarship.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

Amis and Amiloun zugleich mit der altfranzösischen Quelle, herausgegeben von E. KÖLBING. Nebst einer Beilage: Amicus ok Amilius Rímur. cxxxi, 256 pp. Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, 1884.

Octavian, zwei mittelenglische Bearbeitungen der Sage, herausgegeben von GREGOR SARRAZIN. xlv, 191 pp. Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, 1885.

These two works form the second and third volumes of the Altenglische Bibliothek, edited by Professor E. Kölbing, the first volume of which was Osbern Bokenam's Legenden, edited by C. Horstmann (1883), and the annual continuations, so far as announced, will be the Ancren Riwe (1886), Arthour and Merlin (1887), and the Ormulum (1888), all to be edited by E. Kölbing. This is an excellent scheme, and we are grateful to Professor Kölbing for the fruits of the zeal with which he is devoting himself to the study of Middle-English literature, and especially the making accessible at moderate price of such

valuable works as the *Ancren Riwe* and the *Ormulum*. It is an example worthy of imitation by English scholars, who have ready access to the manuscripts of these works.

The *Amis* and *Amiloun* will be found in Weber's *Metrical Romances of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1810), heretofore the sole edition, and edited almost exclusively from one MS, the Auchinleck (A). Kölbing has made use of the four MSS, using A as the basis, and giving the variations of S, the Duke of Sutherland's, D, Douce MS 326, and H, Harleian MS 2386. He prefixes a long and valuable introduction, containing a description of the MSS, the stanza and verse, the dialect, and the style of the English version. This is followed by an account of the three MSS of the French version, the one of the Icelandic version, and a section treating the literature of this saga and discussing the Latin prose versions—with a reprint of one of these—and the subject-matter of the English poem, questions already discussed by Kölbing in Paul and Braune's *Beitraege*, IV 273-9 and 311 ff., and in *Englische Studien*, II 307 ff., so that his remarks here are to be regarded as supplementary; but it would have been better to repeat here the substance of his former articles, for it is not every one, especially in this country, that has access to those periodicals.

Kölbing regards the French version, here printed for the first time from a MS (K) of the first quarter of the thirteenth century, as the older, and says it would be hard to find any English poem in the twelve-line riming stanza of the *Amis* and *Amiloun* belonging to so early a date, the earliest MS of the present poem dating from about 1300. This stanza rimes as follows: *aabaabccbddb*, the *b*-rime lines containing three accents and the others four, all having the usual iambic rhythm, or attempts at it. Under "Dialect" Kölbing treats briefly the vowels and the inflection as shown by the rimes, and comes to the very just conclusion that *Amis* and *Amiloun* arose on the northern border of the East-Midland district, for we find northern forms mingled in an East-Midland dialect. This might be seen also from the forms which do not appear in rime, for while *children* is common, we frequently find also *childer* and *childre*, for which MSS S, D, H give usually *childern* and *children*. Interesting forms of the plural possessive are seen in the following lines:

And what þe childres names worn (23),

þe children is names, as y 3ow hy3t (37).

In line 23 D and H write *childern*, and in line 37 they omit *is*, thus disregarding the possessive ending. The English version consists of 2508 lines, whereas the French has but 1250, and is written in riming couplets. The Icelandic contains twelve cantos, usually of four-line stanzas with alternate or couplet rime, but sometimes the stanzas contain only three lines, the first being longer than the second or third, which last rime, and in one case two lines, the first having double middle- as well as end-rime, though this might be arranged as a four-line stanza in riming couplets.

The addition of a word-register, and even of a short glossary, would have made the volume more serviceable, but we are still grateful for the trilingual form of this Middle-English story.



The Octavian contains both the Southern and Northern English versions of this romance, the latter in two parallel texts. The introduction describes each version separately. The Southern is preserved in but one MS, among the Cottonian MSS of the British Museum, and dating from the middle of the fifteenth century. It has been already published in Weber, though with some errors, a corrected list of which is given by Sarrazin. The metrical form of the romance is the stanza of six lines, riming *aaabab*, *a* containing four accents in iambic rhythm and *b* two. The place and date of this version are next considered, the rimes alone being here also brought under review, and much less fully than in the *Amis* and *Amiloun*, and the conclusion is reached that its home was certainly Kent or a neighboring district, and its date soon after the middle of the fourteenth century. The florin of Edward III, first coined in 1343, is mentioned, so that it cannot be earlier than that date. The relation of this version to its source is next treated, and it is decided to be a translation from the French romance of Octavian, published after the Oxford MS (Bodl. Hatton 100), by K. Vollmöller in 1883. An analysis of the contents of both and their variations are given. Then follow sections on the style and composition of the poem and on the poet, whom Sarrazin thinks he has proved to be the same as the author of *Lybeaus Disconus*—found in Ritson's *Ancient English Metrical Romances*, Vol. II, and in Furnivall and Hales' edition of the *Percy Folio MS*, Vol. II—and of *Launfal*, also found in Ritson, Vol. I, and recently republished by L. Erling (1883) with the French original; but compare K. Breul, in *Englische Studien*, IX 461, contra. A similar consideration of the Northern English version follows. It is contained in two MSS—C, in the University Library at Cambridge (Ff. II 38), from the first half of the fifteenth century, and L, in the Cathedral Library at Lincoln (A 5, Thornton MS), from the middle of the fifteenth century. The former MS was used by Halliwell in his edition of the romance of Octavian (1844) for the Percy Society, but the latter has never been published before. The metrical form of the poem is the twelve-line stanza, riming *aabecbdddbeeb*, like that of *Amis* and *Amiloun*, only the second couplet differs from the first. The place and date of the poem are next treated, the rimes of C alone, as before, being brought forward as evidence, and the conclusion is reached that the home of the poet was probably north of the Humber, and his time about the year 1350. He too mentions the florins of Edward III. This version is also translated from the French romance above mentioned, but is entirely independent of the Southern version. The writer of the latter referred to a Latin source, though none such is known, and it is not mentioned by this poet, who followed his source more closely than the other, and surpassed both the French and the Southern English poets in poetic power. He may be the same as the author of *Sir Isumbras*; but compare Breul (*loc. cit.*) contra. Though not equaling the introduction of Kölbing, Sarrazin's gives useful information, but we might desire a more thorough treatment of the grammatical forms. While the writer of L certainly lived north of the Humber, the writer of C may have come from the northern border of the East-Midland district, as in case of the author of *Amis* and *Amiloun*, and the dialectic differences between the two MSS have not been noted by Sarrazin. Breul, in his appreciative review of the two volumes (*vid. sup.*), says: "L hat freilich oft die älteren nördlichen formen

gewahrt," but it is not so plainly older as more northern forms that we find here. A few taken at random may be given as specimens: 83 C *chyl dren*, L *childre*, and so often, though in 344 C we find *chyl dyr*; 91 C *tythyngys*, L *tythande*; 103 C *schalle*, L *salle*, though L has also *schalle*; 114 C *lykyth*, L *lykes*; 162 C *haue*, L *hase*; 163 C *fleyng*, L *flyande*; 166 C *brennyng*, L *byrnand*, though in 164 C has *brennande* for the sake of the rime; 194 C *moche*, L *mekille*, though *mekille* is found also in C; 192 C *churche*, L *kyrke*; 196 C *gode*, L *gud*; in pronouns, where C has *whom*, *they*, *ther*, *them*, *sche*, *hur*, *hyt*, L has *whaym*, *thay*, *thaire*, *thame*, *scho*, *hir*, *it*; 208 C *hystenyth*, L *herkyns*; 214 C *soche*, L *swylk*; 248 C *oon*, L *ane*, though L has *one*, too; 287 C *eche*, L *ilke*; 338 C *rennyng*, L *rynnande*; 356 C *into*, L *intille*; 433 C *can*, L *gone*, and so often; 442-3 C *sometyme*, L *vmwhile*, etc. These examples might easily be multiplied, but it is plain from phonology, inflection and expression that L is written in a more northern dialect than C, and I should be inclined to regard C as written in the East-Midland dialect, with some northern forms intermingled. Here too a word-register is lacking, and a glossary for unusual words, which would have aided the reader.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

Englische Lautlehre für Studierende und Lehrer, von AUG. WESTERN. Vom Verfasser selbst besorgte deutsche Ausgabe. Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, 1885.

Kurze Darstellung der englischen Aussprache für Schulen und zum Selbstunterricht, von AUG. WESTERN. Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, 1885.

The first of the above-mentioned works is a full, careful and systematic presentation of English phonetics, based on the works of Sweet, Storm, and Viotor, and the author's own study of English pronunciation under the personal direction of Mr. Sweet. It should, therefore, represent the present pronunciation of English in England, but if so, this does not coincide with the best pronunciation of English in America. I have heretofore had occasion to take exception to some of Mr. Sweet's pronunciations (compare my review of Storm's *Englische Philologie* in this Journal, II 484 ff., 1881), and must renew my criticisms in the case of his pupil. Western adopts the Bell-Sweet vowel system, but with some additions, and classifies the consonants according to the position of the tongue and lips in their formation, so that in the new terminology the English *w* is a *Lippenzungenwurzellaut*. The symbols by which the vowel-sounds are designated are easily understood from the keywords, but surely the *vowel*-sound in *air* differs from that in *name* more than by the addition of a short *i* to the former, yet *air* = *æi'* and *name* = *neim*.

Western follows Sweet in his disregard of *r*, as may be seen above, and this runs through the whole work, even in the case of words in which the *r*-sound is distinctly preserved in the best American pronunciation. So too in the neglect of initial *h* for *what* = *wot*, and the same is seen in *which*, *whether*, etc., so that cockneyism is now published to the continental nations as the best prevalent English pronunciation. Other pronunciations that run counter to the present writer's notions may be seen from the following examples: *leisure* = *lish's*, though *lesh's* and *li'sh's* are allowed (cf. pp. 18 and 54); *vary* = *vee'ri*,

the vowel-sound as in *air*; *more* and *morning* have the same vowel-sound: "So dass in Wirklichkeit kein Unterschied mehr zwischen Wörtern wie *born* und *borne*, *morning* und *mourning* existiert" (p. 21); *torz*, *pour*, *soar*, *door*, *floor*, are pronounced with the vowel-sound of *all*, so that the long *o* no longer exists before *r*, and in such words as *no*, *ago*, *stone*, etc., it is represented by *ou*; certainly many Americans pronounce *no* without this *u*-prolongation. The disposition to neutralize *r* is carried so far that *figure* = *fig's* in Western's symbolism; *object* = *ob'dahikt*, the sound of *y* in *pity*; and this sound is also given to the first syllables of *expect*, *exhibit*, *example*, *examine*, like *i* in *imagine*; we even find *police* = *po'liis*, *cashier* = *ks'chii's*, etc.; but space is lacking to give all the words, or even classes of words, to the pronunciation of which exception might be taken. As this work has appeared in both Danish and German, it is reasonable to suppose that it will represent the prevalent pronunciation of English on the Continent, particularly as the more scientific work has been rewritten for schools in the form of the *Kurze Darstellung der englischen Aussprache*. If this is correct English pronunciation, it is readily seen how far the English have departed from the older pronunciation of the language, which has been preserved more purely on this side of the water, and it will soon be hard to say whether a given pronunciation is "good English" or not. What hope, moreover, is there for ever attaining a reformed spelling on phonetic lines, if the same words must be spelled different ways for Englishmen and for Americans? I relegate this question to the Spelling Reform Associations of the two countries.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

## REPORTS.

ANGLIA. Zeitschrift für englische Philologie. Herausgegeben von R. P. WÜLKER und M. TRAUTMANN. VIII Band. Halle, 1885.

I. Fr. Holtbuer opens the first number of the eighth volume of *Anglia* with an article of forty pages entitled *Der syntaktische Gebrauch des Genitives in Andreas, Gúthlac, Phōnix, dem heiligen Kreuz, und Höllenfahrt*. This article has been suggested by a similar one by Rössger on the Syntactical Use of the Genitive in *Cynewulf's Elene, Juliana, and Christ* (*Anglia* VIII 338), so that it is another contribution to the *Cynewulf*-question, but from a syntactical point of view. The first part of the article is a very full and thorough (intended to be a complete) collection of examples of the use of the genitive in its various relations in these poems, following the arrangement of Rössger, who has followed that of Nader in his treatises on the use of the cases in "*Bēowulf*." The second part of the article compares the results of this investigation with those of Rössger, finding considerable variations, after making allowance for the difference in length of these poems from those treated by Rössger. Hence Holtbuer concludes that he is justified in denying the identity of *Cynewulf* with the authors of these works. Such a conclusion, however, seems to proceed from the comprehensive major premise that a writer must use the same syntactical combinations, and hence, to a certain extent, the same vocabulary, notwithstanding the different subjects on which, the different periods at which, and the different circumstances under which, he may have written. From one very material point the opposite conclusion might be drawn, for Holtbuer says: "*Mit geringen Ausnahmen stimmten die in beiden Untersuchungen gemeinschaftlich vorkommenden Verben hinsichtlich ihrer Rection überein.*" As with most of these attempts to settle the genuine works of *Cynewulf*, *adhuc sub judice lis est*.

E. Hönncher follows with an article of forty-four pages on the Sources of the Anglo-Saxon Genesis. This article is chiefly notable for its treatment of the fourth section, the interpolation B 245-851, in which Hönncher combats the view of Sievers that the interpolator used as his source the Latin hexameter poem of Alcimius Avitus. He finds in the introduction relating to the fall of the angels a following of Gregory, not, with Thorpe and Bouterwek, of Aelfric, for he wrote too late. For the rest, the Vulgate, including the Apocrypha, and common Church tradition are the only sources. In his summing up (p. 84) he attributes the variations from the Vulgate to (1) reasons of a poetic kind; (2) the influence of tradition, as in Bede; (3) a freer treatment of the Bible, as generally with the Anglo-Saxons, seen also in Aelfric; (4) the national Anglo-Saxon character, which is manifested even in their sacred poems and in the Latin poems of Alcuin. While not agreeing with Sievers as to the use of Avitus by the interpolator of B, he thinks that this writer was acquainted with the work of Avitus.



W. Sattler continues his Contributions to Präpositionslehre im Neuenglischen with XIX, examples of *of* and *from* used with the verbs *borrow, buy, gain, get, have, hear, hire, learn, obtain, order, procure, purchase, raise, receive, rent, steal, take, and win.*

C. Horstmann continues his valuable texts of English Legends of Saints with four prose legends from MS Douce 114 (dialect of Nottinghamshire?). These are: (1) S. Elizabeth of Spalbeck, the Latin original of whose life is lost, hence the English version is the more valuable; (2) S. Christina Mirabilis; (3) S. Mary of Oegines (Oignies), a voluminous life of fifty pages; and (4) a letter of Stephen of Senis touching the life of S. Katherine of Senis. These legends are translations from the Latin, and their subjects are all Belgian saints, the first three of whom lived in the thirteenth century, and the fourth in the late fourteenth century. The four legends are written in one hand and by the same translator, who, in his Apologiek at the close of the whole, "besecheth alle men and wymmen that in happe redith or herith this englyshe that they be not over-capcyous ne curyous" about it, "as umwhile sotheren, oterewhile northen—but the cause why nedith not to be tolde." This, with the Latin inscription on the MS, in a hand not much later, that it belongs to the Carthusian Monastery of Beauvall, in the County of Nottingham, leads Horstmann to regard the dialect as that of Nottinghamshire.

S. Levy closes this number with Noch einmal die Quellen Cymbeline's.

2. The first part of the Anzeiger to this volume contains the following reviews:

Geoffrey Chaucer's Werke übersetzt von A. von Düring, I, 1883, by J. Koch; Murray's New English Dictionary, I, 1884, by H. R. Helwich; The Language of the Later Part of the Peterborough Chronicle, Academical Dissertation by O. P. Behm, 1884, by Dr. A. Würzner; Die erste nichtchristliche Parabel des Barlaam und Josaphat, ihre Herkunft und Verbreitung, von E. Braunholtz, 1884, by H. Brandes; Amis and Amiloun zugleich mit der altfranzösischen Quelle, herausgegeben von E. Kölbing, 1884, by E. Einenkel; Beiträge zu einer phonetischen Vokallehre, von J. Gutersohn, I and II, 1881-82, and 1883-84, by E. Einenkel; Die wichtigsten Eigentümlichkeiten der englischen Syntax, von Dr. D. Petry, 1885, by D. Asher; Langenscheidt's Notwörterbücher, n. d., by D. Asher; K. Warnke and L. Proescholdt, Pseudo-Shakespearian Plays: I. The Comedy of Fair Em. II. The Merry Devil of Edmonton. Revised and edited with introduction and notes, 1883, 1884, by H. Fernow; Dr. Ficke, A Critical [!] Examination of Addison's Cato, 1885, by Dr. H. von Dadelsen, who shows up Dr. Ficke's ignorance of English very plainly.

Under Verschiedenes we have two lengthy essays, one by E. Menthel, Zur Geschichte des Otfridischen Verses im Englischen, and the other by E. Holthaus, Beiträge zur Geschichte der englischen Vokale. Menthel divides his essay into three parts: I. Der viertreffer von seinen anfängen bis zum King Horn. II. Die achttreffige langzeile. III. Die entwicklung der achttreffigen zur siebentreffigen langzeile. He is a follower of Trautmann, whose views have been expressed in Anglia II 153, V Anz. 111 and VII Anz. 211. He finds the first examples of this verse in English in Aelfric and

in two poems of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, a. 959 and 1036, regarding the former as written after Aelfric. Several Middle-English poems of the thirteenth century, some with alliteration, some with end-rime, and some mixed, are set down as written in this verse. After Trautmann, Layamon is held up as the chief representative of it, and after Wissmann, King Horn is also included. Even the *Poema Morale* and the *Ormulum*, the verse of which both ten Brink and Schipper have regarded as imitated from the *septenarius* of the Latin hymns, are brought into the same scheme, Menthel holding that no example of a hymn in that rhythm before Orm's time is known to us, and so Orm had no model for his metre in the Christian Latin poetry. Trautmann's assertion (*Anglia* V, Anz. 124), that Orm borrowed no foreign metre, but used one already prevalent in England, the four-accented verse of Otfrid, for the formation of his long line, is therefore regarded as fully justified. Menthel holds with Wackernagel that the verse of Otfrid is imitated from the iambic dimeter catalectic of the Latin hymns, but that such imitation did not arise independently in England, and this verse was borrowed from Germany. Not a scintilla of evidence is produced for such an assertion, and it would be well for our laborious German friends to investigate the literary relations of England and Germany from the ninth to the thirteenth century before venturing on such sweeping assertions. But if Otfrid, in the late ninth century, could form a German verse on the Latin iambic dimeter catalectic, what would prevent as skillful a metrician as Orm, in the early thirteenth century, from forming an English verse in like manner and giving to it an iambic dimeter catalectic, thus forming the English *septenarius*? Menthel's view of the development of the seven-accented line from the eight-accented is by no means convincing, nor is it conceded that the earlier poems claimed as belonging to the so-called Otfrid-verse are written in that verse; but we relegate the discussion to Trautmann and Schipper, for "it is a very pretty quarrel as it stands," only adding, as heretofore stated, that to an ordinary English ear the views of Schipper are most in accordance with the principles of English versification.

E. Holthaus bases his discussion of the English vowels on Ellis's great work, and follows the vowel-system of Trautmann. He treats in this article: I. Das lange *u*. II. Die Geschichte des *ou*. III. *ai*, *ei*, *i* (lang). IV. Die Aussprache des kurzen *u*.

M. Trautmann closes this number with a correction to his Otfrid in England (*Anglia* VII, Anz. 211), and, under Wortgeschichtliches, with some brief remarks on *dear*, as in "our dearest foe," *good-bye*, and *light*, as in "to make light of," which he regards as the same as *lite* (= *little*), A.-S. *lȳt*.

3. A. Stormfels begins the third number with an essay of sixty-two pages on *Der altfranzösische Vokalismus im Mittelenglischen bis zum Jahre 1400*. He pronounces his investigation "die erste eingehende Behandlung der Schicksale welche die afr. Vokale auf englischem Boden im Munde der germanisch redenden Engländer erlitten haben," and he is doubtless correct, for this has long been a deficiency in the history of English phonology. The basis of his criticism rests upon the rimes, in which Romanic and Germanic words are united, the consistency of the orthography, and the further development towards Modern English, especially the phonology of the sixteenth

century. All of the chief existing monuments of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, except the *Ormulum*, and many of the fourteenth—from the *Poema Morale* to Chaucer inclusive—are brought under review, the Latin original word in each case furnishing the starting-point of the development. The present article contains the treatment of *a*, *e* and *ɛ* (= Latin *æ*, *ē*, *ī*), and *i*, to be followed by the treatment of *au*, *o*, *u*, *oi* and *ui*. It is only by such investigations, and especially of the Old-French element of English—which term Stormfels prefers to “the so-called Anglo-Norman”—that a firm foundation can be laid for the history of English phonology.

K. Elze contributes A Letter to C. M. Ingleby, Esq., containing Notes and Conjectural Emendations on Shakespeare's “*Cymbeline*,” written in English.

F. Kluge furnishes forty pages of text of *Angelsächsische Excerpte aus Byrhtferth's Handboc oder Enchiridion*, from the Oxford MS Ashm. 328, now for the first time printed.

R. Rössger prints his above-mentioned essay, *Über den syntaktischen Gebrauch des Genitivs in Cynewulf's Elene, Crist, und Juliana*. After an introduction on the origin, historical development, and meaning of the genitive, in which the writer shows himself to be an opponent of the local theory of the cases, he treats the genitive occurring in these works in connection with a substantive, with verbs, with adjectives, and the adverbial genitive, thus supplying a valuable contribution to Anglo-Saxon syntax.

K. Schmidt prints, under the title *Digby-Spiele*, the as yet unprinted portion of his Berlin dissertation (1883), basing his studies on Furnivall's edition of the *Digby Mysteries*. This portion contains *Maria Magdalena*, the *Morality Wisdom*, and the *Burial and Resurrection of Christ*, the first part having contained the introduction, *Candelmas Day* and the *Kyllynge of the Children of Israell*, and the *Conversyon of Seynt Paule*.

F. G. Fleay contributes *Annals of the Careers of James and Henry Shirley*.

H. Fischer discusses briefly the question, *Gibt es einen von Dryden und Davenant bearbeiteten Julius Caesar?*, deciding it in the negative.

W. Creizenach, *Zu Greene's James the Fourth*, finds its source in the *Hecatomithi* of *Giraldi Cinthio*.

B. Leonhardt writes *Über Beziehungen von Beaumont und Fletcher's Philaster zu Shakespeare's Hamlet und Cymbeline*. After some remarks on the two dramatists and a full synopsis of the contents of “*Philaster*,” Leonhardt compares certain passages of the play with passages in “*Cymbeline*” and in “*Hamlet*,” and concludes that the relations are undeniable. He finds the character of *Philaster* drawn from *Hamlet*, and the love-story of the play from “*Cymbeline*”; hence, says he, “‘*Cymbeline*’ must have existed before 1608.” Resemblances of other characters are traced, and that of *Bellario*, the beauty of which Leonhardt fully recognizes, is compared as page to *Pisanio*, and in some respects to *Imogen* herself. He takes exception to the view of *Henry Ward* and of *Herrig* that *Bellario* is a copy of *Viola*. While some features of certain characters in these plays have some resemblance to each other, it would

be hard to say that Beaumont and Fletcher consciously imitated Shakespeare.

F. Kluge contributes Angelsächsische Glossen, from Addit. MS 32,246 of the British Museum, dating from the eleventh century, which serve in some cases to correct the Wright-Wülker glosses, edited from the Oxford Junius MS; but this MS does not seem to be identical with the original of the Junius MS, which once belonged to the painter Rubens, but is now lost.

F. Holthausen has some brief Bemerkungen zu Chaucer's Canterbury Tales.

B. Leonhardt adds a Schlusswort zu "Cymbeline," contra Levy, as Beilage.

4. The second part of the Anzeiger contains the following reviews:

Shakespeare—Notes by F. A. Leo (1885), reviewed by D. Asher; Floris and Blancheflur, herausgegeben von E. Hausknecht, n. d., by G. Lüdtkke; Chaucer Society, Essays on Chaucer, his Words and Works, Part V (1885), containing XIII to XVII inclusive, by J. Koch; Grundriss zur Geschichte der angelsächsischen Litteratur, von Dr. R. Wülker (1885), by E. Einkenkel; York Plays, edited, with Introduction and Glossary, by Lucy Toulmin Smith (1885), by L. Proescholdt; Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum, by H. L. D. Ward, Vol. I (1883), by R. Wülker; Lehmann, H.-Brünne und Helm im angelsächsischen Bëowulf-liede. Ein Beitrag zur germanischen Altertumskunde (1885), by R. Wülker; The Psalter or Psalms of David and Certain Canticles, with a Translation and Exposition by Richard Rolle of Hampole, edited from the manuscripts by H. R. Bramley (1884), by W. Bernhardt; The Life of Saint Katherine, from the Royal MS 17 A XXVII, with its Latin Original, edited by Dr. E. Einkenkel for the E. E. T. S. (1884), by E. Förster; Thackeray's Lectures on the English Humourists of the Eighteenth Century, herausgegeben von E. Regel. I. Swift. VI. Sterne und Goldsmith (1885), by H. Effer.

Under Verschiedenes, the chief essay, of nearly sixty pages, is Über die Quellen des Stabreimenden Morte Arthure, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Arthursage, by P. Bränscheid. This work was edited by Perry for the E. E. T. S. in 1865, re-edited by Brock in 1871, after comparison with the only known MS, the Thornton MS in the library of the Cathedral at Lincoln, and on this edition Bränscheid bases his examination. He brings into comparison as sources of the work Geoffrey of Monmouth's Chronicle, Wace's Brut, Layamon's Brut, Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle, and Peter Langtoft's Chronicle. After a careful examination of these by sections, he comes to the conclusion (p. 212) that Geoffrey and Layamon are the Chronicles which the poet of the Morte Arthure used as his sources, and chiefly Geoffrey, with additions here and there from Layamon. The work consists of 4346 long lines, and a further examination of the section 2386-3205, which does not agree with either of the above-mentioned Chronicles, goes to show that, besides these, the poet used at least two French romances, of which one belongs to the Arthur-cycle and the other does not belong to it. Bränscheid suggests the question whether the poet had an original that already contained what is common to him with Geoffrey and Layamon and his additions to these



Chronicles. He brings into notice here Sir Thos. Malory's *Morte D'Arthur*, but asserts as plain that Malory used English as well as French books; that in his last books he copied from *Le Morte Arthur* (edited by Furnivall, 1864), and also turned into prose, almost word for word, part of the above-mentioned *Morte Arthure*. Hence neither Malory, nor his printer Caxton, knew of any such original, nor is it probable that the poet had such an one.

L. Proescholdt writes *Ein Wort über die neusprachlichen Lesebücher und zur Reform des Unterrichts*.

J. Koch contributes a short essay on *Der Valentinstag*.

M. Trautmann closes the number with *Metrische Antglossen*—a reply to Schipper's *Metrische Randglossen* (*Englische Studien*, IX 1)—in which he defends his former views of the prevalence of Otfrid-verse in Middle-English works, but with much that is purely personal. As stated above, the views of Schipper seem to this writer well-grounded, and those of Trautmann a forced effort to assimilate English and German verse, but the method is too Procrustean to succeed, and, so far from the world's forgetting Schipper's *Altenglische Metrik*, as Trautmann advises, it is to be hoped that he will speedily complete it on the lines laid down, with additional proofs of the correctness of his principles, and will translate it into English, in order that the long-felt want of a suitable treatise on English metre may be supplied. *A priori*, it is not probable that any Middle-English poet ever heard of Otfrid, or thought of "imitating" his verse, as Menthel will have it; and *a posteriori*, notwithstanding the efforts of Trautmann and his scholars, it still remains to be proved that any Middle-English poet has ever imitated it. (See also Schipper in *Englische Studien*, X 1, 192.)

Trautmann has withdrawn from the joint editorship of *Anglia*, and Wülker will hereafter conduct it alone.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

#### FLECKEISEN'S JAHRBÜCHER FÜR CLASSISCHE PHILOGIE, 1884.

##### Fascicle 1.

1. *Zur Homerischen Worterklärung des Aristarchos*. Max Hecht published in 1882 his doctor dissertation, "*Quaestiones Homericæ*," Königsberg, and won great praise by it. The present article is a review of his treatment of the Homeric use of the word *γῦα*, and is by E. Kammer. He takes exception to Hecht in three points, denying, first, that *γῦα* may denote *genua et membra communia*; secondly, that it denotes the same as *μέλεια* (members in general); and thirdly, that *γῦα* is only a metrical synonym for *μέλεια* and *πέτεια*. The reasons for each exception are given at length; it was an oversight that two sections of the article should have been numbered 12. As a reply to these exceptions, Hecht published (Königsberg, 1884) a brochure of 29 pages, "*Zur Homerischen Semasiologie*," holding still that *γῦα* denotes members in general (*glieder überhaupt*) and occasionally the knees. Kammer (pp. 523 ff., series 1884) offers a vigorous objection to the whole pamphlet, taking Hecht to task for bad logic and an unwillingness to interpret Homer through Homer. His position is that *γῦα* primarily

denotes the knees and only occasionally has the meaning of members in general.

2. *Homerische Kleinigkeiten*. There are ten of them here by Prof. Moriz Schmidt, of Jena.

3. *Pausanias und seine Ankläger*. H. Brunn, München. The report of the *Jahrb.* in the last No. of the *A. J. P.* (VII, 262, 265, 266) gives some idea of the discussion prevailing in Germany, 1883-4, concerning Pausanias. Treu, J. Hirschfeld, Löwy, and Preller are his critics; Schubart and Brunn his supporters.

Hirschfeld is most outspoken; he believes that P. never was in Olympia, and that he was an out-and-out plagiarist in everything he wrote that had to do with matters subsequent to the middle of the second century B. C., but will not name Polemon as the source from which he drew. Treu holds that he may possibly have visited Olympia, but that his enumeration of statues of athletes does not reach beyond the point just mentioned (150 B. C.), and that from this point on Pausanias copied from Polemon; essentially as Hirschfeld holds. The second point in Treu's position Schubart is willing to concede; Brunn, however, in this very judicious and sensible article, doubts the necessity of this concession. Schubart inclines to believe that Löwy (*Künstlergeschichte*, Wien, 1883) has shown its necessity. Preller holds to the theory of plagiarism, and mentions Polemon as the authority used.

4. *Zu Cicero's De Natura Deorum*. Six critical and explanatory notes on §§21, 24, 25, 78, 105 and 110 of Bk. I, by A. Goethe.

5. *Erotematia*. The third question will interest the American Archaeological Institute. In its publication on the excavations at Assos, it gives the Greek form of a vote and oath of the people of Assos at the beginning of Caligula's reign. Why not change *διὰ σωτήρα* to *Δία σωτήρα* and *κρίνειν* to *κρίνειν*?

6. A review, by O. Harnecker, of Brzoska's inaugural dissertation (Breslau, 1883), *De Canone Decem Oratorum Atticorum Quaestiones*. This is hardly more than an analysis of Brzoska's work, the first 29 pages of which give an exposition of various features of the canon and arrive at the negative result that Caecilius of Kale Akte is not its author. The next 25 pages (30-55) are devoted to proving that the canon originated in Asia at the end of the second century B. C.; the next 25 (56-80) to proving that it was adopted in Pergamon before the time of Apollodoros. Pages 81-100 give an account of the ancient practice of placing master-works, as well as the currents of thought they started, in connection and comparison with the liberal arts. With this dissertation it is well to compare Reifferscheid's *Festrede zum Geburtstag des Kaisers in the Index Scholarum Vratislav. w. 1881-82*, v. Wilamowitz, "Antigonos von Karystos" (*Phil. Untersuch. Heft 4*), and Blass, "Griech. Beredsamkeit von Alexander bis Augustus" (Berlin, 1865).

7. *Zu den griechischen Elegikern*. Sitzler. Critical notes.

8. A note of two pages on Cicero's *De Imperio Pompei*, §§17-19, by A. Mosbach, entitled "Zu Cicero's Pompeiana."

9. Zu Tacitus Historien; Notes on II 75, III 77 and V 17 by A. Eussner, mainly critical.

10. Zu Horatius Episteln. First, the note by R. Duncker. It covers I 15, 10, and proposes exactly the same change which Rieck (*Jahrbücher*, 1879, pp. 69 f.) proposed, but perhaps with more force—the change of *dicet eques* to *dicet equus*. Second, the note on II 1, 173, *quantus sit Dossennus edacibus in parasitis*, by Cron, which favors printing without the capital D, and rendering *dossennus* “hanswurst,” “witzbold”; or with Ritschl, taking the whole line, “quantus ipse scurra sit in scurris parasitis describendis.”

11. De Vergilii Arte Rhythmica. J. Draheim, Berlin. The general conclusion reached is, to quote: Vergilius, ictuum et accentuum discordiam in alteram, tertiam quartamque arsin admisit, in extremis concordiam praeoptavit, perpetuum autem amborum concentum vitavit.

12. Cicero's Reden gegen Catilina. On Or. I §1, *quid proxima*, by Wichmann, Eberswalde.

13. Valuable critical notes, “Zu den Scriptores Historiae Augustae,” by Peter.

#### Fascicle 2.

14. A review of the four numbers on Greek and Sicilian Vases, published by Benndorf. The review is by Eugen Petersen, recently of Prague, but now connected with the German school at Athens. The main faults which this able review finds with Benndorf's work are that only 61 plates were published, when 80 were promised, and that, owing to other responsibilities of the editor, less interest was manifested toward the end of the work.

15. Zu Aischines Rede gegen Ktesiphon. C. Troost. Both Weidner (Leipzig, 1872, Berlin, 1878) and F. Schultz (Leipzig, 1865) touch to some extent upon the MSS of this oration. The present article aims to establish an ancient codex from which the *schedae* Scrimgeri come, and the common origin of ε, κ and λ (h) on the one hand, and all other existing MSS on the other, from a somewhat altered copy of this ancient codex.

16. Zur Überlieferung von Ciceros Briefen. L. Mendelssohn, Dorpat, pp. 108–10 and 845–55. On the two great MSS, M 49, 9 (the Medicean) and M 49, 7 (Petrarch's copy) and the question how (as a loan?) and when (1389?) M (= 49, 9; 49, 7 being designated as P) came to Milan.

17. Beiträge zu Polybios. Büttner-Wobst, Dresden. “P. follows few rules of composition beyond the avoidance of hiatus.”

18. H. Balser in this article, “Über einige Spuren einer periphrastischen Conjugation in den italischen Dialekten,” contributes to the discussion of the form *manafum*, in an Oscan execration from Vibia (Büheler, Oskische Bleitafel, Frankfurt-a.-M., 1877). *Manafum* he takes as identical with *mandans sum*, and is led into a discussion of the phonetic laws governing *-ns* in Oscan. See also Bugge, “Altitalischen Studien” (K. Z. XXII 385).

19. Max Schneidewin (*Statistisches zu Homeros und Vergilius*) doubts the correctness of Scherer's words (p. 175 in his "Über Darstellung und Sprache in Vergil's Aeneide") that the speeches in V. are long and studied, while in Homer the heroes speak almost only "winged words."

20. De Anno Natali T. Lucretii Poetae. J. Woltjer. The conclusion is reached that Lucretius was born 97 and died 53 B. C.; Hieronymus or some copyist having erred in noting the natal year of Lucretius. The gloss *Virgilius natus est ante incarnationem dni ann. LXX* may originate from Suetonius or some exceedingly remote MS.

21. Horazische Composition (Carm. I 6). Th. Plüss. Kiessling's very good work on this ode (*Philolog. Untersuchungen*, II 95 ff.) lacks in clearness, a fault which P. contributes to remove.

### Fascicle 3.

22. Homerische Probleme. F. Weck. Critical notes on A 290, Δ 157, Ε 195 (= Σ 426, ε 89), and Ψ 805.

23. Sparta und der Ionische Aufstand. This is Busolt's reply to Niese (*Hist. Zs.* XLIII 408 or *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1884, Nr. 2). "Her operations against Argos made Sparta little inclined to lend aid to the Ionians, and the political situation in the Peloponnesos forced her to await the attack of the Persian, for weal or woe, at the Isthmos."

24. Zu Sophokles Elektra. A critical note by G. H. Müller on line 1394.

25. Zu Parmenides. K. J. Liebhold.

26. Zu Isaïos. K. Lugebil, St. Petersburg.

27. Miscellen zur älteren römischen Geschichte. F. Cauer. I. On the union of the traditional expulsion of the kings with the historical commencement of the consular fasti. II. On the overthrow of the Decemvirs. III. Whether, from the beginning of the republic on, plebeians might be consuls, and the *lex Licinia* changed this possibility to a right. See Schäfer, *Jahrbücher*, 1876, pp. 574 ff.

28. Die Eleganz des Terentius im Gebrauch des Adjectivums. P. Barth. I. The use of the neuter adjective as a substantive. II. The use of the adjective in the mas. or fem. as a substantive. III. The predicate use of the adjective.

29. Zu Catullus. K. P. Schultze. On 45, 8 and 17, and against Ellis's interpretation of *sinistra sternunt*.

30. Zu Livius; continuation from pp. 673-91, for the year 1881. Critical notes, by M. Müller, on Books 27-30, which do not appear in his text-edition in the Teubner series. In this connection Heidenhain has a good note on V 5, 4, *cum stipendium*, in which he proposes *olim* for *cum*.

31. Nochmals Ovids Gedichte aus der Verbannung und die Varusschlacht. Th. Matthias. Against Reimarus, Brandt (*Zu Dion Cassius*, LVI 18) and Wiolet (*Leipz. Studien* 180-82), who hold 10 A. D. as the year of the defeat of Varus. M. holds to the year 9, and still maintains that all references in



Ovid to this vexed question confirm the dates which the historians have given for this defeat.

32. Zu Eutropius. Critical notes by C. Schrader.

33. Berichtigung zu Th. Bergk's Beiträgen zur römischen Chronologie. G. Hinrichs.

34. Preisaufgabe für das Jahr 1887. "An historical presentation of the social relations of husbandry in the Byzantine empire from Justinian to the Latin Empire." Value \$250.

35. Philologische Gelegenheitschriften.

Fascicles 4 and 5.

36. Thirty-eight pages of "Untersuchungen zur griechischen Geschichte," by H. R. Pomtow, Rome. The subject is the expedition of the Persians against Delphoi, in 9 chapters. The 8th really concludes his discussion, the points of which are that Herodotos and his followers are the only authorities upon whom we may rely, and that he and Ephoros drew from the accounts of priests. The victory-ode in the temple is then discussed, and the inconsistency between it and the words of Mardonios (Herod. IX 42) noted. Recent critics have attempted to explain it in various ways, none of which, upon Pomtow's examination, can be accepted by him. The conclusion he himself reaches is that the Persians who appeared at Delphoi were only robbers, and that the sparing of Delphoi was due to the oracle, which Mardonios learned of through Onomakritos.

37. Zu Thukydides. Liebhold. On VI 78, 82 and 84.

38. Die *ἐξωτερικοί λόγοι* bei Aristoteles und Eudemos. Susemihl, Greifswald. "It does not contradict anything in Aristotle if we, in partial accord with the commentators, divide the great majority of his writings into (1) exoteric, intended for the public, (2) acroatic, for his school, (3) hypomnematic, for his own use. This does not include the letters, nor the historical works, nor the natural history, etc." See Diels, "Über die exoterischen Reden des Aristoteles" (Monatsber. der Berl. Akad., 1883, pp. 477-94).

39. Zu Lucianos. A continuation of Sommerbrodt's work in the Jahrbücher, 1883, pp. 128-32.

40. Zu Plutarchos. F. L. Lentz, Königsberg. On Brut. §2, Agis §2, Solon §15, Aemilius Paulus §28.

41. Der Becher des Ziegenhirten bei Theokritos. K. Zacher, Breslau. Against understanding that the *κισσύβιον* was shaped so deep that ornamentations, like the running acanthus, could not have been rather upon the inside than upon the outside.

42. Zu Demosthenes Friedensrede [§24]. Liebhold.

43. Forty-one pages on "Die strophische Gliederung in den stichischen Partien des Terentius," by K. Meissner, Bernburg. "The stichic portions of the cantica of Terence are divided into strophes, that is, all stichic divisions of the iambic octonares, the trochaic septenarii, the iambic

senarii so far as they belong to the canticum and not to the diverbium, and the iambic septenarii. In these divisions, excepting the last, in which every two equal verses always make a strophe, we always have three united into one strophe."

44. Zur Chronologie der Correspondenz Ciceros seit Caesars Tode. O. E. Schmidt. E. Reute brought out a very good dissertation, "Die Correspondenz Ciceros in den Jahren 44 und 43" (Marburg, 1883), which removed many difficulties in the chronology of the Ciceronian correspondence. But his new dates are not established with equal care, and especially in the 15th book ad Atticum he seems to S. to have failed badly. At the end S. gives a chronological table of the 15th book ad Att.

45. Wann wurde Apollon zum Sonnengott? P. Stengel answers, "At least later than Homer."

#### Fascicle 6.

46. Das letzte Chorlied der Sophokleischen Elektra. Th. Plüss. "If the chorus believes the deed of Orestes and Elektra was a deception practised upon them by the gods, and Hermes kept this concealed from them, where, logically, lies the acquiescence in the deed, by chorus and spectator; and what becomes of the much-talked-of theodicy of Sophokles?"

47. Zu Sophokles Elektra. G. Kern. Critical note on l. 92.

48. H. Buermann, Berlin. Über Isaios bei Dionysios von Halikarnasos.

49. Zu der Sphaerik des Theodosios. F. Hultsch.

50. Miscellen. K. E. Georges, Gotha.

51. O. Langlotz. Review of H. Ziemer's Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Comparison. The strongest exception taken to Z.'s work is in his following Kvíčala (Zs. für d. öst. Gymn., 1858, p. 529) in reducing the genitive after superlatives, as well as after comparatives, to a genit. of separation. Langlotz still holds to its partitive force: see his "De Genitivi Graeci cum Superlativo Coniuncti Ratione et Usu," Leipzig, 1876.

52. Die Annalen des Tanusius und Volusius. L. Schwabe. Against P. E. Sonnenburg's "Historische Untersuchungen" (Bonn, 1882), and in favor of identifying the Annales of T. and those of V. See Haupt, Quaest. Catull., Opusc. I 71; Schwabe, Quaest. Catull., p. 280; B. Niese, Rhein. Mus. XXXVIII 600, etc.

53. Die Abfassungszeit von Ciceros Cato Major. Maurer. This places the date before Caesar's assassination.

54. Emendationes Vergilianae. Baehrens. On the Aeneid, Bk. I.

55. A critical note, "Zu Horatius Oden," III 8, 5, by F. Harder; and II 1, 6, by A. A. Draeger.

56. Zu Caesar. H. Gilbert. Critical notes on B. Gall. I 18, 3; IV 8, 1; V 7, 8; B. Civ. I 32, 7; III 16, 3.

W. E. WATERS.

ROMANIA, No. 53 (Vol. XIV).

P. Meyer. Les premières compilations françaises d'histoire ancienne. I. Les faits des Romains. II. Histoire ancienne jusqu'à César. The author says by way of preface: "Ce qui suit n'est pas un travail achevé: ce n'est guère que l'esquisse d'un travail à faire. Au cours de mes recherches sur la légende d'Alexandre, j'ai eu à m'occuper de deux compilations d'histoire ancienne qui, originairement distinctes, se rencontrent unies dès le XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Soit joints soit séparés, ces deux ouvrages ont obtenu un très grand succès. Il en a été fait un nombre considérable de copies; ils ont été diversement remaniés et continués. L'un d'eux a été, dès le commencement du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, traduit en toscan. Ils forment, si je ne me trompe, le plus ancien livre d'histoire ancienne qui ait été écrit en prose française." He then proceeds to give a literary and bibliographical account of these works, the second of which is the later in composition and serves as a kind of preface to the first. *Les Faits des Romains* is devoted almost exclusively to the history of Julius Caesar. It may be of interest to those who still find pleasure in their *De Bello Gallico* to see how their author will look in Middle-Age dress, and so I transcribe a few lines of the first chapter. It will be observed that a process of rejuvenation, so to speak, has been resorted to in regard to the proper names.

"France estoit molt grans au tens Juille Cesar: ele estoit devisee en .iij. parties. Li François qui manioient en une des parties estoient apelé Belgue. Cil de la seconde partie Poitevin ou Aquitain, tot a un; cil de la tierce Celte. Ces .iij. manieres de François n'estoient pas d'un langage ne d'une maniere de vivre. Belgue estoient li plus fort a cel tans, genz sanz soulaz et sans compaignie, por ce que loingtain estoient, ne marcheanz ne genz d'autres terres ne reperoient gueres entre euz, qui i portassent choses ne deduit qui les cuers des gens amoloient aucune foiz."

Gaston Raynaud. Le Miracle de Sardenai. Rectifies and complements an article on the same subject by Raynaud in *Romania* X, pp. 519-37.

Alfred Morel-Fatio. Notice sur trois Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque d'Osuna. The Library of Osuna, whose last owner, D. Mariano Tellez Giron, died June 2d, 1882, has just been purchased by the Spanish Government. This collection should rather be known as the Library of the Infantado, since its foundation and most important acquisitions are due to the Mendoza family. The Marquis of Santillana formed the first nucleus at Guadalajara. Then, in the sixteenth century, the fourth Duke of the Infantado, named like his ancestor D. Inigo Lopez de Mendoza, devoted himself with the greatest zeal towards increasing the collection. The three MSS above mentioned, dating from the fifteenth century, and lately acquired by the Bibliothèque Nationale from Belgium, formerly belonged to this collection, as they bear the escutcheon of the original founder. The first, containing a translation into Castilian of the *Liber de Montibus, Silvis, Fontibus*, etc., of Boccaccio, of a discourse by St. Basil, and of the Axiochus, has been numbered 458 and placed in the "Fonds espagnol." The second is a translation into Italian of the Tusculan Questions (Fonds it., No. 1703). The third is likewise Italian (Fonds it., No. 1702), and contains the

Corbaccio of Boccaccio in Tuscan. All three, but especially the first two, afford valuable evidence of the origin of Spanish humanism.

J. Ulrich. *Chansons ladines*. These are three historic songs. The first, "La Chanson de Guillaume Tell," is given in two versions, one in the Upper-Engadine, the other in the Sursilvan, dialect. The former belongs to the earliest period of Ladin literature. Both versions are made from a German original. The second, "Ŭna chianzun davard la ruvijna da Plugr" (which took place Sept. 4, 1618), is probably original, and is in the Upper-Engadine dialect. The third is a translation from the German, in the same dialect. It treats of the battle of Chiavalaina or Malserhaide, which was fought in 1499.

Comptes-rendus. M. Gaster, *Literatura populară română*. Cu un apendice: *Voroava garamantilor cu Alexandru Machedon de Nicolae Costin*. Bucuresci, 1883, in-8, xii-605 pp. Until within the last few years students of Roumanian literature have been compelled to rely mainly on the book of Chas. Nisard (1854; 2d ed. 1864); but latterly two books by native scholars have appeared which make possible a very thorough study of this literature. The first of these, *Cărțile poporane ale Românilor in secolul XVI* (by M. Hasdeu), forms the second volume of the collection entitled *Cuvente den bătrâni Limba română vorbită între 1550-1600* (cf. *Romania* X 347); the second is the above-mentioned book, which is very favorably reviewed by Kr. Nyrop.

Chronique. Short notice of the death of the famous Bibliophile Jacob (Paul Lacroix), who died October 16, 1884.

No. 54.

A. Mussafia. Berta e Milone.—Orlandino. M. here publishes his third and last extract from the "Codice Marciano Gall. XIII" (see *Romania* III, p. 339, and IV, p. 91).

A. Thomas. Notice sur deux manuscrits de la *Spagna*, en vers, de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris. These two MSS of the B. N., though described by Dr. Marsand in 1835, have been overlooked by scholars. T. examines them, and finds they are identical with the two described, in 1871, by Pio Rajna, in the *Propugnatore* (Vol. I, p. 337 *et seq.*), as belonging, the one to the Riccardian Library of Florence, the other to the Communal Library of Ferrara. They differ slightly only towards the end. The first canto of each is given.

P. Meyer. Inventaire des livres de Henri II, Roi de Navarre. A reprint, with criticism and corrections, of an inventory of the books of Henry II published by C.-A. Rahlenbeck in the *Annales du Bibliophile belge* of 1882.

C. Nigra. Il Moro Saracino, canzone popolare piemontese. A very short song with a very long comment on its origin and various versions.

Nos. 55-6.

E. Müntz. La Légende de Charlemagne dans l'art du Moyen Âge. In his *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne*, Mr. Gaston Paris gives a detailed



account of the origin and growth of the legend of the great Emperor of the Franks. Müntz gives a brief parallel study of the influence wrought by this legend in the ecclesiastical architecture, sculpture, tapestry and other allied arts.

F.-A. Wulff. *Le Conte du Mantel*. Texte français des dernières années du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, édité d'après tous les mss. The subject of this story is the trial to which are subjected the ladies of the court of King Arthur. One after the other they try on an enchanted cloak, which, according as it fits or does not fit, attests their fidelity or inconstancy. But one of them comes off with honor—the lady-love of the knight Carados. The mantle, which makes its wearer proof against melancholy and the pangs of love, is thereupon bestowed upon her. Besides canvassing the relative merits of the MSS, the various readings of all are given in the foot-notes.

P. Meyer. Notice d'un ms de la Bibliothèque Phillipps, contenant une ancienne version française des fables d'Eude de Cherrington (ou Cheriton). Eude de Cherrington has been principally known up to the present time by his collection of fables. In 1868 Oesterley published an edition of them from the Arundel MS 292 of the British Museum, under the title of "*Narrationes Magistri Odonis Ciringtonia*" (see *Jahrb. für rom. u. eng. Literatur*, IX 127 *et seq.*; cf. for some additions XII 129-54). He published in 1871, from the Wolfenbüttel MS, some fables wanting in the Arundel MS (Opus cit. XII 129 *et seq.*). Recently L. Hervieux, after giving, in Vol. I of his *Fabulistes latins*, an account of the MSS of these fables, published in Vol. II a complete edition of the fables themselves. The French translation (unknown up to the present), of which Meyer here gives some extracts, occupies in the Phillipps MS fourteen and a half pages, and seems to have been written about the second half of the thirteenth century. It bears the title *Les Parables Maystre Oe de Cyrintime*.

P. Rajna. *Contributi alla storia dell' epopea e del romanzo medievale*. In 1884 (Firenze, Sansoni) Rajna published his book "*Sulle Origini dell' Epopea Francese*." The present article furnishes addenda to his book. The following headings will indicate their character: I. *Le origine dell' epopea francese secondo A. G. Schlegel*. II. *Il Fauriel e la cosiddetta teorica delle cantilene*. III. *Ci falt la geste que Tuoldus declinet*. IV. *Due pretesi dati cronologici per la storia della Chanson de Roland*. (To be continued.)

E. Langlois. *Un nouveau ms de la Chanson d'Anseis, fils de Gerbert*. Hitherto but three MSS of the *Chanson d'Anseis* have been known, two at the B. N., the other at the Arsenal Library at Paris. The one, an account and extracts of which are here given, is in the Vatican Library, Urbino section, No. 375.

N. Zingarelli. *La fonte classica di un episodio del Filocopo*. The "episodio" here spoken of is the "quarta questione d'amore" of the work in question. After referring to the second idyl of Theocritus, the eighth eclogue of Virgil, an epode of Horace, and the sixth book of Lucan's *Pharsalia* as possibly suggestive of the story, the writer continues: "Ma qui il

Boccaccio più che giovare di una o più descrizioni classiche, ne ha copiata una *ad litteram*, ed il suo originale è stato l'episodio del libro VII delle *Metamorfosi*, nel quale è presentata Medea che fa con incantesimi ringiovanire il vecchio padre di Giasone." To prove his statement he then collates passages from the Roman and Italian authors.

G. Raynaud. Poème moralisé sur les propriétés des choses. The extracts here printed are taken from a MS, 12,483, of the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris. This MS, though containing divers pieces of verse, forms a complete whole. It was composed in the fourteenth century, in honor of the Virgin. The volume is divided into two books and these into fifty chapters each. Forty-three of these chapters are now, however, wanting. The poet first gives, in verses of eight syllables, the description of some animal, plant, stone, or something else; sets forth its properties, which he compares one by one with similar qualities of the Virgin, thereby symbolizing her various virtues. This is done with all the *naïveté* of a religious devotee.

Paul Meyer. Notice de quelques mss de la Collection Libri à Florence. The Italian Government a few years ago purchased the larger part of the collection of MSS sold, in 1847, by Libri to the late Lord Ashburnham. About a hundred of them the purchasers refused to take, because, as was proved by the Provost (L. Delisle) of the Bibliothèque Nationale, they had been stolen from various public libraries. The remainder of the collection has been deposited in the Laurentian Library at Florence. These MSS are mostly of Italian origin, but a few of them are of special importance for French literature. Of these Meyer proposes to give a detailed account, and likewise extracts from the same.

L. Clédat. Le patois de Coligny et de Saint Amour. Devoted exclusively to the morphology of this dialect. C. promises to give a study of its phonetics in a future paper.

Comptes-rendus. Une énigme historique. Les Roumains au moyen âge, par A.-D. Xénopol, professeur d'histoire roumaine à l'Université de Jassy. Paris, Leroux, 1885. A. Taverney pronounces this a good *résumé* of what has been written on the subject up to the present, rather than the result of original investigations. Zur Kritik und Geschichte des altfranzösischen Rolandsliedes. Von A. Parkscher. Berlin, 1885, in-8, 135 pp. G. Paris says: "Ce mémoire fait avec beaucoup d'intelligence à pour but de pousser plus loin l'étude de quelques-uns des problèmes que soulève l'histoire de la *Chanson de Rollant*." The author seeks mainly to prove two things: "L'une, que la chanson a subi la revision d'un clerc qui en a beaucoup accentué le caractère religieux; l'autre, que l'épisode de Baligant, également oeuvre d'un clerc, était encore étranger au poème dans des rédactions assez récentes." Die Lais der Marie de France, herausgegeben von Karl Warnke. Mit vergleichenden Anmerkungen von Reinhold Koehler. Halle, Niemeyer, 1885, in-8, quatre-iv-276 pp. This is the third volume of the *Bibliotheca Normannica*, which Suchier began to publish about five years ago (see Romania IX 172). Zur Kritik der Bertasaga. Habilitationsschrift von Alfred Feist, Dr. Phil., Marburg, 1885, in-8, 32 pp. The author compares

the numerous versions of the story of *Berthe au grand Pied*, and endeavors to make a genealogical classification.

The Chronique contains notice of four works published on the occasion of the Paris-Talbot marriage (July 20, 1885). They are: *Manuscripts de la bibliothèque de l'Université tirés des dépôts littéraires*. Par Emile Chate-lain, Paris, typographie A. Labouret; *Notes sur l'histoire des prépositions françaises en, ens, dedans, dans*, par Arsène Darmesteter. Paris, Léopold Cerf, petit in-8, 22 pp. (A curious piece of information is here given in regard to *dans* (de + intus), which is said to have been almost unknown before the sixteenth century, since which time it has little by little usurped the place of *en*, which has now become obsolete except in certain fixed constructions); *La pistola que fon tramesa an GASTON PARIS lo jorn que pres molher de part lo sieu bon amic* (tiré à trente-six exemplaires numérotés, chez Marchesson, au Pay), petit in-8, 7 pp. (name of author not given); *Sonatori, balli e canti nuziali del popolo siciliano*, per Giuseppe Pitre. Palermo, in-8, 14 pp. This ends the fourteenth volume of the Romania.

SAMUEL GARNER.

## BRIEF MENTION.

The executors of the distinguished Egyptologist, Professor GUSTAVUS SEYFFARTH, have published (New York, E. Steiger & Co.) *The Literary Life of Gustavus Seyffarth, an Autobiographical Sketch*, and *Gustav Seyffarth, eine biographische Skizze, von KARL KNORTZ*. Dr. Seyffarth was known to every scholar in the country, to many personally, to very many by correspondence. As to the merits of his long controversy with other Egyptologists, few are competent to pronounce; but no one can deny the pathetic interest of these records of a long life of scholarly endeavor and scholarly enthusiasm, to which the atmosphere of intelligent appreciation was here denied and there malignant.

---

Dr. J. H. HEINRICH SCHMIDT has brought to a close his elaborate work, *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache*, by the publication of the fourth volume (Leipzig, Teubner, 1886), with a register of words (pp. 689-722) and an index of passages (pp. 723-875) to all four volumes, but he has not succeeded in carrying out his own plans, as he frankly confesses, and we have only 208 families out of the 256 which he had expected to complete before taking his hand from a subject which, in the nature of things, can never be exhaustively treated. It is the first great effort to bring the vast field under tilth, and grateful recognition has not been lacking even on the part of those who are not kindly disposed towards the author's achievements in other directions, and many will admit that Schmidt's 'Synonymik' is an indispensable book who have little but reprobation for the 'Kunstformen.' But Dr. Schmidt looks upon his own philological work as a whole, and refuses the suffrages of those who do not accept all his teachings. Standing, as he does, outside of the philological guild, he has the advantages of a rich life, a wide experience, a free vision, with the drawbacks incident to such a position, especially in a land of tradition like Germany, where intellectual movements come mainly through university channels. It is the feeling of this comparative isolation that has given a strong personal tinge, not free from bitterness, to the author's vindication of his career prefixed to this volume. But the ample recognition that Dr. Schmidt has received from abroad seems to have not been without result in his own country, and it is to be hoped that the last stretches of his life, for which he has reserved some of his most important work, will be rich in the experience of well-rewarded toil. From a practical point of view we have reason to congratulate ourselves that Dr. Schmidt intends to put forth, in the course of 1887, a compact Handbook of Greek and Latin Synonyms, which cannot fail to be of great service to those who have sufficient command of German to appreciate the points that are made. A translation into English would require special attainments, special gifts, and should not be undertaken lightly. A good knowledge of English and German synonyms is a prerequisite, and as the ordinary manuals



often leave one in the lurch, the translator must have a delicate perception of the proprieties of English speech, which can only be gained by long familiarity with the best literature and by actual artistic handling of the language. As to the dangers that environ the translator, one illustration may suffice, and that one is drawn from Dr. Schmidt himself. On Pind. O 5, 12 I had said "canals can be stately" (*σεμνοί*). To this Dr. Schmidt objects, and remarks (p. 642): "Stattlich und *σεμνός* ist doch etwas ganz verschiedenes." But the same thing might be said of "stattlich" and "stately." To be sure, Passow translates *σεμνός* "stattlich," and Dr. Schmidt may quarrel with him on the German side; but "stattlich" is often used where "stately" would be inappropriate, and it may be mentioned as a curiosity that in the long list of equivalents to "stattlich" given by Hilpert "stately" does not occur once. If *ὄχετοί* means "streams," as Dr. Schmidt contends, and not "canals," then *σεμνοί* in Pindar's *σεμνοὺς ὄχετοὺς* must be taken as in Eur. I. T. 401: *ῥέματα σεμνὰ Δίρκας*, and Troad. 206: *τῶν σεμνῶν ἰδμάτων*, with distinct recognition of the *σέβω* element such as we find in all the Aeschylean passages. If *ὄχετοί* there means "canals," I cannot help thinking that "stately" is not bad, as it would not be bad in Hel. 431: *πύλας σεμνὰς ἀνδρὸς ὀλβίου*. In Dem. 3, 26: *οἰκίαν σεμνοτέραν* might fairly well be translated "a more stately house," and Tennyson's "stately ships" by *σεμναὶ νῆες*. This, then, by way of illustrating the extreme difficulty of the subject, a difficulty which Dr. Schmidt cheerfully acknowledges, a difficulty on which he has brought to bear wide reading, keen sympathy, and that lively fancy without which work in this field is hopeless. B. L. G.

---

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie. Herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft für deutsche Philologie in Berlin. Siebenter Jahrgang, 1885.

The second part of this valuable bibliography is just received, completing the volume. The section on English contains 285 titles, and is under the direction of D. J. Koch, Berlin. It may be cheerfully commended to students of Germanic philology, who will find it a useful summary of the current literature.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Allen (J. Barrow). *Rudimenta Latina*. New York, *Macmillan*, 1886. 120 pp. (Clarendon Press Series.) 16mo, flex. cl., net, 50 cts.

Caesar. *Gallie War*; ed. by Francis W. Kelsey. Boston, *J. Allyn*, 1886. 508 pp. 12mo, hf. leath., \$1.25.

Cicero (Marcus Tullius). *Select Orations*; ed. by J. H. and W. F. Allen and J. B. Greenough. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1886. 15 + 250 + 226 + 194 pp. 12mo, cl., \$1.40.

— *Tusculan Disputations*; tr. by Andrew P. Peabody. Boston, *Little, Brown & Co.*, 1886. 23 + 331 pp. 12mo, cl., \$1.25.

Grove (J. H.) *Latin Exercises*. Delaware, O., *L. S. Wells*, 1886. 168 pp. 12mo, cl., net, \$1.10.

Harper (W. R.) *Elements of Hebrew*. 7th ed. Chicago, *American Pub. Soc. of Hebrew*, 1886. 263 pp. 12mo, cl., net, \$2.00.

— *Introductory Hebrew Method and Manual*. 3d ed. Chicago, *American Pub. Soc. of Hebrew*, 1886. 263 pp. 12mo, cl., net, \$2.00.

Herodotus. *Egypt and Scythia described by Herodotus*. New York, *Cassell & Co.*, 1886. 192 pp. 32mo, pap., 10 cts.

Hippocrates. *The Genuine Works*; translated by Francis Adams. In 2 Vols. Vol. I. New York, *W. Wood & Co.*, 1886. 395 pp. 11.8vo, cl., subs. \$1.25.

Plutarch's *Lives of Alcibiades, Coriolanus, Aristides, and Cato the Censor*; tr. by J. and W. Langhorne. New York, *Cassell & Co.*, 1886. 192 pp. 32mo, pap., 10 cts.

*Rigveda (The)*, by Adolf Kaegi; authorized translation, with additions to the notes by R. Arrowsmith. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1886. 8 + 198 pp. 8vo, levant cl., \$1.65.

Sallust. *The Jugurthine War*; ed. by C. G. Herbermann. New York, *Appleton*, 1886. 3 + 272 pp., map. 12mo, cl., \$1.30.

Winchell (S. R.) *Elementary Lessons in Greek Syntax*. New York, *Appleton*, 1886. 107 pp. 12mo, cl., 63 cts.

### BRITISH.

Adams (Ernest). *The Elements of the English Language*. 21st ed. Post 8vo, 256 pp. *Bell & Sons*. 4s. 6d.

*Æschylus. Plays*. Tr. by Robert Potter. (Morley's Universal Library.) Post 8vo, 278 pp. *Routledge*. 1s.

Apistophanes. The Acharnians, The Knights, and The Birds, by John Hookham Frere. (Morley's Universal Library.) Post 8vo, 272 pp. *Routledge*. 1s.

Bullinger (E. W.) Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament. 2d ed., revised. Roy. 8vo, 1000 pp. *Longmans*. 15s.

Cassiodorus. The Letters of Cassiodorus: Being a Condensed Translation of the *Variae Epistolae*. With an Introduction by Thomas Hodgkin. 8vo, 580 pp. *Frowde*. 16s.

Chamberlain (Basil Hall). A Simplified Grammar of the Japanese Language (Modern Written Style). Post 8vo, 114 pp. *Trübner*. 5s.

Euripides (Scenes from). The Cyclops. By A. Sidgwick. (Rugby Edition of Greek Plays.) New ed. Fcap. 8vo, 48 pp. *Rivingtons*. 1s. 6d.

Firdausi. The Sháh Námeḥ of the Persian Poet, Firdausi. Translated and Abridged in Prose and Verse, by James Atkinson. Ed. by Rev. J. A. Atkinson. (Chandos Classics.) Post 8vo, 440 pp. *Warne*, sd., 1s. 6d.; 2s.

Homer's Iliad. Edited, with English Notes and Introduction, by Walter Leaf. Vol. I, Books 1-12. 8vo, 454 pp. *Macmillan*. 14s.

Mansfield (E. D.) A Primer of Greek Syntax. 8vo, 60 pp. *Rivingtons*. 1s. 6d.

Plutarch's Life of Lucius Cornelius Sulla. With Introduction, Notes, and Lexicon by Rev. Hubert A. Holden. 12mo, 450 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 6s.

Schleyer (John Martin). Grammar of Volapuk, by W. A. Seret. Fcap. 8vo, 70 pp. *Whittaker*. 2s. 6d.

Swettenham (Frank A.) Vocabulary of the English and Malay Languages, with Notes. Revised ed. Vol. I. English-Malay. 8vo, 290 pp. *Whittingham*. 10s.

Virgil's Æneid. Freely translated into English Blank Verse, by William J. Thornhill. Post 8vo, 550 pp. Dublin, *Hodges*. *Longmans*. 7s. 6d.

Wherry (E. M.) Comprehensive Commentary on the Qurán. (Trübner's Oriental Series.) Vol. IV. 8vo 340 pp. *Trübner*. 10s. 6d.

## FRENCH.

Barbier de Meynard (A. C.) Dictionnaire turc-français. Supplément aux dictionnaires publiés jusqu'à ce jour. Second volume, 1<sup>re</sup> livraison. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 10 fr.

Batiffol (Pierre). Les Manuscrits grecs de Bérat d'Albanie et le Codex purpureus Φ. In-8. *Leroux*. 4 fr.

Bourciez (Eduardus). De Praepositione ad casuali in latinitate aevi Merovingici. In-8. *C. Klincksieck*. 4 fr.

Derenbourg (Joseph). Le livre des parterres fleuris. Grammaire hébraïque en arabe d'Abou'l-Walid Merwan ibn Djanah de Cordoue. Gr. in-8. *Vieweg*. 25 fr.

Graux. Les Textes grecs publiés par Charles Graux. Edition posthume dirigée par son père et surveillée par Ch. Emile Ruelle. Gr. in-8. *Vieweg*. 12 fr.

Halévy (J.) Essai sur l'origine des écritures indiennes et Notes sur l'origine de l'écriture perse. Avec 2 planches. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 3 fr.

Havet (L.) Cours élémentaire de métrique grecque et latine. In-12. *Dela-  
grave*. 4 fr.

Lévi (Sylvain). Le Brihatkathāmañjari de Kshemendra. In-8. *Leroux*. 4 fr.

Meylan (H.) Nonius Marcellus: Col'ation de plusieurs manuscrits de Paris,  
de Genève et de Berne. Suivie d'une notice sur les principaux manuscrits de  
Nonius pour les livres 1, 2 et 3, par Louis Havet. Gr. in-8. *Vieweg*. 5 fr.

Olivier (Léon A.) Grammaire élémentaire du grec moderne. In-8. Athènes,  
*Reinwald*. 5 fr.

Pareja (F.) Arte de la lengua Timvqvana compvesto en 1614 y publicado  
conforme al ejemplar original único por Lucien Adam y J. Vinson. Gr. in-8.  
*Maisonneuve*. 15 fr.

Regnaud (Paul). Essais de linguistique évolutionniste. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*.  
20 fr.

Toubin (Charles). Dictionnaire étymologique et explicatif de la langue  
française et spécialement du langage populaire. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 15 fr.

#### GERMAN.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische. 1 Bd., 1 u. 2 Hft., gr. 8. Breslau,  
*Koebner*. m. 3.20. Inhalt: 1. Zur griechischen Nominalcomposition. Von  
Prof. Dr. Konr. Zacher. vii, 97 S. m. 2.—2. De Stoicorum studiis rhetoricis.  
Scripsit Dr. Frz. Striller. 61 S. m. 1.20.

Albracht (Frz.) Kampf u. Kampfschilderung bei Homer. 4, 52 S. Pforta.  
Naumburg, *Domrich*. m. 1.

Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta, collegit Valentinus Rose. 8,  
iii, 463 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 4.50.

Äschylos' Perser. Erklärt v. W. S. Tauffel. 3 Aufl., bearb. v. N. Wecklein.  
gr. 8, vi, 119 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 1.20.

Ausonii Burdigalensis, Decimi Magni, opuscula. Rec. Rud. Peiper. Adiecta  
est tabula (photolith.). 8, cxxviii, 556 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 6.60.

Avesta. Die heil. Bücher der Parsen, im Auftrag der kaiserl. Akademie  
der Wissenschaften in Wien hrsg. v. Karl F. Geldner. I. Yasna. 3 Lfg.,  
Imp.-4, S. 161-239, m. 1 Lichtdr.-Taf. Stuttgart, *Kohlhammer*. à m. 8.

— The Sacred Books of the Parsis, edited by Karl F. Geldner. I.  
Yasna. Fasc. 3, Imp.-4, S. 161-239. Ebd. à m. 12.50.

Baunack (J.) u. Baunack (T.) Studien auf dem Gebiete d. griechischen u.  
der arischen Sprachen. 1 Bd., 1 Tl., gr. 8, x, 218 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. m. 6.

Beck (Rich.) Einleitung u. Disposition zu Cicero's fragmentarisch erhaltener  
Rede in Clodium et Curionem. gr. 4, 31 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. baar m. 1.

Bezold (Carl). Kurzgefasster Überblick üb. die babylonisch-assyrische  
Literatur, nebst e. chronolog. Excurs., zwei Registern u. e. Index zu 1700  
Thontafeln d. British-Museum's. gr. 8, xv, 395 S. Leipzig, *O. Schulze*. m. 12.

Boeckh (Aug.) Encyklopädie u. Methodologie der philologischen Wissen-  
schaften. Hrsg. v. Ernst Bratuscheck. 2 Aufl., besorgt v. Rud. Klussmann. gr.  
8, x, 884 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 14.

Böhtlingk (Otto). Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung. 6 Thl., 2 Lfg.,  
Imp.-4, iii, u. S. 161-306. St. Petersburg. Leipzig, *Voss' Sort*. m. 4. (I-VI,  
m. 49.70.)



Boelte (Felix). De artium scriptoribus latinis quaestiones. Diss. gr. 8, 53 S. Bonn, *Behrendt*. m. 1.

Bondi (J. H.) Dem hebräisch-phönizischen Sprachzweige angehörige Lehnwörter in hieroglyphischen u. hieratischen Texten. gr. 8, 130 S. Leipzig, *Breitkopf & Härtel*. m. 3.

Brugmann (Karl). Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. 1 Bd. Einleitung u. Lautlehre. gr. 8, xviii, 568 S. Strassburg, *Trübner*. m. 14.

Bruhn (Ewald). Lucubrationum Euripidearum capita selecta. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol.", 15 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 102 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.80.

Buchholz (E.) Anthologie aus den Lyrikern der Griechen. 1 Bdchn. Die Elegiker u. Jambographen enth. 4 vielfach umgearb. u. erweit. Aufl. gr. 8, viii, 195 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 1.80.

Buchwald (Ferd.) Quaestiones Silianae. Diss. gr. 8, 32 S. Gorlicii. Breslau, *Köhler*. m. 1.

Buhler (G.) Üb. e. Inschrift d. Königs Dharasena IV v. Valabhl. [Mit 1 Taf.] [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 22 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. —70.

Cappeller (Carl). Sanskrit-Wörterbuch, nach den Petersburger Wörterbüchern bearb. (In 4 Lfgn.) 1 Lfg., Lex.-8, 128 S. Strassburg, *Trübner*. m. 3.

Cassel (Paulus). Zophnat Paneach. Aegyptische Deutungen. 1 Fragment. gr. 8, 34 S. Berlin, *Kühl*. m. 1.

Cauer (Frdr.) Die römische Aeneassage von Naevius bis Vergilius. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol.", 15 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 86 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.40.

Christ (A. Th.) Die Art u. Tendenz der Juvenalischen Personenkritik. gr. 8, 23 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. —75.

Collitz (Herm.) D. neueste sprachforschung u. die erklär. d. indogermanischen ablautes. [Aus "Beiträge zur Kunde der indogerman. Sprachen."] gr. 8, 40 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* m. 1.

Cornelii Nepotis de excellentibus ducibus exterarum gentium liber. Zum Schulgebrauch aus Herodot., Thucydides, Plutarch u. a. Schriftstellern berichtet u. ergänzt v. Karl Christ, Konr. Völker. 3, teilweise umgearb. Ausg., besorgt v. W. Crecelius. gr. 8, 120 S. Elberfeld, *Fassbender*. m. 1.

Curtius (Geo.) Kleine Schriften. Hrsg. v. E. Windisch. 1 Thl., mit 1 (Stahlst.-)Bildnisse. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. m. 3. Inhalt: Ausgewählte Reden u. Vorträge. Mit e. Vorwort v. Ernst Curtius. xxix, 173 S.

Dorsch (Ernst). De civitatis romanae apud Graecos propagatione. Diss. gr. 8, 70 S. Breslau, *Köhler*. m. 1.

Droste (Paulus). De adiectivorum in εὐδης et in ὠδης desinentium apud Platonem usu. Diss. gr. 8, 51 S. Marburgi. Dortmund, *Garms*. m. 1.

Einzelbeiträge zur allgemeinen u. vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft. 1 Hft., gr. 8. Leipzig, *Friedrich*. m. 3. Inhalt: Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft u. Carl Abels ägyptische Sprachstudien v. geh. Reg.-R. Prof. Dr. Aug. Frdr. Pott. viii, 106 S.

Euclidis opera omnia. Edd. I. L. Heiberg et H. Menge. (Vol. III.) Elementa. Ed. et latine interpretatus est I. L. Heiberg. Vol. III. Librum X continens. 8, vi, 417 S., m. eingedr. Fig. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 4.50. (I-IV, m. 17.10.)

Euripides, ausgewählte Tragödien. 3 Bdchn. Medea. 2 Aufl. Erklärt von Hans v. Arnim. gr. 8, xxvi, 120 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 1.50.

Fokke (A.) Rettungen d. Alkibiades. 2 TL.: Der Aufenthalt d. Alkibiades in Sparta. gr. 8, iv, 112 S. Emden, *Haynel*. m. 2. (1 u. 2, m. 3.75.)

Fröhlich (Fr.) Einige stilistische u. realistische Bemerkungen zur militärischen Phraseologie d. Tacitus. gr. 4, 18 S. Aarau, *Sauerländer*. m. —80.

Gaii institutionum iuris civilis commentarii IV. [Aus "Iurisprudentiae antejustinianae reliquiae," ed. Ph. E. Huschke.] 8, 256 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.70.

Gasda (Aug.) Kritische Bemerkungen zu Dio Chrysostomus u. Themistius. 4, 19 S. Lauban. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. —90.

Geisler (Eug.) De Apollinaris Sidonii studiis. Diss. gr. 8, 83 S. Breslau, *Köhler*, 1885. m. 1.

Gellii (A.) Noctium atticarum libri XX ex recensione Mart. Hertz. Ed. minor II. 2 voll., 8, ix, 274 u. 359 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 4.20.

Gerber (A.) et Greef (A.) Lexicon Taciteum. Fasc. VI, gr. 8, S. 577-704. Leipzig, *Teubner*. à m. 3.60.

Gerstenberg (Heinr.) De Eugraphio Terentii interprete. Diss. gr. 8, 118 S. Jena, *Pohle*. m. 1.50.

Gesenius (Wilh.) Hebräisches u. aramäisches Handwörterbuch üb. das Alte Testament. 10, verb. u. verm. Aufl., mit Beiträgen v. D. H. Müller. Lex.-8, xlii, 984 S. Leipzig, *F. C. W. Vogel*. m. 15.

Gillischewski (W.) Scidae Horatianae. Part I. 4, 20 S. Lauban, 1885. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. —90.

Glück (Max.) De Tyro ab Alexandro Magno oppugnata et capta. Diss. gr. 8, 53 S. Königsberg, *Koch & Reimer*. m. 1.

Goetz (Geo.) Quaestiones Varronianae. 4, 8 S. Jena, *Neuenhahn*. m. —50.

Guhrauer (Heinr.) Musikgeschichtliches aus Homer. I. gr. 4, 24 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. —90.

Haag (Frdr.) Beiträge zum Verständniss v. Viçākhadatta's Mudrārāksa. I Thl., gr. 8, xii, 19 S. Burgdorf, *Langlois*. m. —80.

Häderli (Rich.) Die hellenischen Astynomen u. Agoranomen, vornehmlich im alten Athen. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol., 15 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 50 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 1.20.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Iwan Müller. 3 u. 4 Halbbd., gr. 8, I Bd., S. 1-618. Nördlingen, *Beck*. à m. 5.50.

Harder (Chr.) De Joannis Tzetzae historiarum fontibus quaestiones selectae. Diss. gr. 8, 89 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 1.60.

Hart (Gust.) Zur Seelen- u. Erkenntnislehre d. Demokrit. gr. 4, 32 S. Leipzig, *Teubner in Comm.* m. 1.

Heikel (J. A.) Üb. die sogenannte βολέως in Mordprocessen. [Aus "Acta societatis scientiarum fennicae."] gr. 4, 13 S. Helsingfors. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. —80.

— Seneca's Charakter u. politische Thätigkeit, aus seinen Schriften beleuchtet. [Aus "Acta societatis scientiarum fennicae."] Ebd. m. 1.50.

Heinsch (Jos.) Commentationum Euripidearum specimen. 4, 24 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. —90.

Hermann (K. F.) Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten. Neu hrsg. v.

H. Blümner u. W. Dittenberger. 3 Bd., 2 Abth., gr. 8. Freiburg i. Br., *Mohr*. m. 10. (II 1; III 2 u. IV m. 24.) Inhalt: Lehrbuch der griechischen Bühnenalterthümer v. Dr. Alb. Müller. Mit 22 Abbildgn. im Text. xi, 432 S.

Hiller de Gaertringen (Frdr.) De Graecorum fabulis ad Thraces pertinentibus quaestiones criticae. gr. 8, 84 S. Berlin, *Haude & Spener*. m. 2.

Hirschfeld (Hartwig). Das Buch Al-Chazari d. Abû-l-Hasan Jehûda Hallewi im arabischen Urtext, sowie in der hebr. Übersetzg. d. Jehuda ibn Tibbon, hrsg. v. H. H. 1 Hälfte, gr. 8, 160 S. Leipzig, *O. Schulze*. m. 5.

Homer. Die homerischen Hymnen. Hrsg. u. erläutert v. Alb. Gemoll. gr. 8, xiv, 377 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 6.80.

Horatius Flaccus (Q.) Erklärt v. Adf. Kiessling. 2 Tl.: Satiren. gr. 8, xxiv, 240 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 2.25. (1 u. 2, m. 5.25.)

— Rec. atque interpretatus est Jo. Gaspar Orellius. Ed. IV maior emendata et aucta. Fasc. 4 et 5, gr. 8, 1 Bd., S. 417–709. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* Subscr.-Pr. à m. 3.

Ignatii Diaconi tetrasticha iambica 53, rec. et brevi adnotatione instruxit C. F. Müller. 4, 32 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 3.

Israelsohn (I.) Samuelis ben Chofni trium sectionum posteriorum libri Genesis versio arabica cum commentario. gr. 8, xii, 186 S. St. Petersburg, *Zinserling*. m. 5.

Jacobi (Herm.) Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Mâhârâshîrî. Text. Wörterbuch. gr. 8, lxxii, 160 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. m. 6.

Jacobitz (Karl) u. Seiler (Ernst Ed.) Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zum Schul- u. Privatgebrauch. 3 Aufl., 5 Abdr., 2 Abthlgn. Lex.-8, xvi, 2006 S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 10; geb., m. 12.

Jahrbücher f. class. Philologie. Hrsg. v. Alfr. Fleckeisen. 15 Suppl.-Bd. 1 Hft., gr. 8, 327 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 6.40.

Jahresbericht üb. die Fortschritte der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft, begründet v. Conr. Bursian, hrsg. v. Prof. Iwan Müller. Suppl.-Bd. [25 Bd.] 1 Hft., gr. 8. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.*—f. Abonnenten d. Jahresberichts, m. 1.80; f. Nichtabonnenten, m. 3.60. Inhalt: Bericht üb. die Mythologie in den J. 1876–1885 u. üb. die Kunstarchäologie in den J. 1874–1885, v. Prof. A. Preuner. 1 Hft., 96 S.

Jordan (H.) Analecta epigraphica latina. gr. 4, 9 S. Königsberg, *Akad. Buchh. v. Schubert & Seidel*. m. —20.

— Der Tempel der Vesta u. das Haus der Vestalinnen. Mit Aufnahmen u. Zeichngn. gr. 4, xi, 85 S., m. 13 Taf. Berlin, *Weidmann*. cart m. 12.

Iurisprudentiae anteiustinianae quae supersunt. Composuit, rec., adnotavit Ph. Ed. Huschke. Ed. V. 8, xx, 880 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 6.75.

Juvenci (C.) Vettii Aquilina, libri evangeliorum IIII. Recognovit Carolus Marold. 8, xviii, 119 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 1.80.

Koenig (C.) τὰ τέλη et οἱ ἐν τέλει verbis quinam intelligendi sint. Diss. gr. 8, 66 S. Jena, *Pohle*. m. 1.

Krebs (J. Ph.) Antibarbarus. 6 Aufl., in vollständ. Umarbeitg. d. a D. Dr. Allgayer besorgten. 5 Ausg. v. J. H. Schmalz. (In 10 Lfgn.) 1 Lfg., gr. 8, 1 Bd., xvi u. S. 1–144. Basel, *Schwabe*. m. 2.

Kühnau (Rich.) Die Trishubh-Jagati-Familie. Mit 5 Taf. gr. 8, xvi, 272 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* m. 10.

Kuhnert (Ernst). Daidalos. Ein Beitrag zur griech. Künstlergeschichte. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol., 15 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 39 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 1.20.

Kurtz (Ed.) Die Sprichwörterammlung d. Maximus Planudes, erläutert. gr. 8, 47 S. Leipzig, *Neumann's Verl.* m. 1.50.

Lagarde (Paul de). Neu-Griechisches aus Klein-Asien. [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen."] gr. 4, 68 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. 3.

Lenstroem (N.) Russisch-deutsches u. deutsch-russisches Wörterbuch. I. Russisch-deutscher Thl., m. 2 Beigaben: "Über russ. Schrift, Aussprache u. Orthographie," u. "Über das russ. Verbum." gr. 8, xii, 704 u. 24 S. Sondershausen, *F. A. Eupel, O. Kirchhoff.* m. 6.

Levy (J.) Neuhebräisches u. chaldäisches Wörterbuch üb. die Talmudim u. Midraschim. Nebst Beiträgen v. H. L. Fleischer. 19 Lfg., Lex.-8, 4 Bd., S. 225-336. Leipzig, *Brockhaus*, 1885. m. 6. (1-19, m. 118.)

Lexikon, ausführliches, der griechischen u. römischen Mythologie. Hrsg. v. W. H. Roscher. Mit zahlreichen Abbildgn. 8 Lfg., Lex.-8, Sp. 1249-1408. Leipzig, *Teubner.* à m. 2.

Liebenam (W.) Beiträge zur Verwaltungsgeschichte d. römischen Kaiserreichs. I. Die Laufbahn der Procuratoren bis auf die Zeit Diocletians. gr. 8, v, 160 S. Jena, *Passarge.* m. 2.50.

Literatur-Blatt f. orientalische Philologie, unter Mitwirkg. v. Johs. Klatt, hrsg. v. Ernst Kuhn. 2 Bd., 4 Hfte., gr. 8, 1 Hft. 96 S. Leipzig, *O. Schulze.* m. 15.

Livi (Titi). Ab urbe condita libri. Erklärt v. W. Weissenborn. 3 Bd., 1 Hft. Buch VI-VIII. 5 Aufl., besorgt v. H. J. Müller. gr. 8, 304 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 2.40.

Lucianus. Recognovit Jul. Sommerbrodt. Vol. I, pars 1. gr. 8, viii, 271 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 3.

Marcks (Erich). De alis, quales in exercitu romano tempore liberae republicae fuerint. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol., 15 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 44 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 1.20.

Martens (W.) Alphabetisch-etymologisches Vokabular zu den Lebensbeschreibungen des Cornelius Nepos. gr. 8, iv, 63 S. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes.* m. —80.

Martialis (M. Valerii). Epigrammaton libri. Mit erklär. Anmerkungen v. Prof. Ludw. Friedlaender. 2 Bde., gr. 8, 523 u. 546 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel.* m. 18.

Miller (Otto). De decretis atticis quaestiones epigraphicae. Commentatio inauguralis philologica. gr. 8, 57 S. Breslau, *Köhler*, 1885. m. 1.

Mittheilungen, archaeologisch-epigraphische, aus Oesterreich-Ungarn. Hrsg. v. O. Benndorf u. E. Bormann. 10 Jahrg. 1886. 2 Hfte., gr. 8, 1 Hft., 128 S. m. 6 Taf. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn.* m. 9.

Mueller (Ernst). De numero Ciceroniano. Diss. gr. 8, 56 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer.* m. 1.

Myska (Gust.) De antiquiorum historicorum graecorum vocabulis ad rem militarem pertinentibus. Diss. gr. 8, 67 S. Königsberg, *Koch & Reimer.* m. 1.20.



Neumeyer (Andr.) Aratus aus Sikyon. Ein Charakterbild aus der Zeit d. achäischen Bundes, nach den Quellen entworfen. 2 Abtln. in 1 Bde. gr. 8, 38 u. 42 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.50.

Niese (Benedict). De annalibus romanis observationes. gr. 4, 15 S. Marburg, *Elwert's Verl.* m. 1.

Nogarolae (Isotae) Veronensis, opera quae supersunt omnia. Collegit Alex. Comes Apponyi. Ed. et praefatus est Eug. Abel. 2 voll., 8, clxxii, 269 u. 477 S., m. Bild in Heliograv. u. 4 Fcsm.-Taf. in Lichtdr. Wien, *Gerold & Co.* m. 24.

Oder (Eug.) De Antonio Liberali. Diss. gr. 8, 61 S. Bonn, *Behrendt*. m. 1.20.

Oesterlen (Thdr.) Komik u. Humor bei Horaz. 2 Hft.: Die Oden. gr. 8, 133 S. Stuttgart, *Metzlers' Verl.* à m. 3.

Pärvatt's Hochzeit. Ein ind. Schauspiel. Zum ersten Male ins Deutsche übers. v. Prof. Dr. K. Glaser. gr. 8, x, 38 S. Triest, *Schimpff*. m. 1.20.

Pauli (Carl). E. vorgriechische Inschrift v. Lemnos. Mit 1 lith. Taf. gr. 8, iv, 81 S. Leipzig, *Barth*. m. 4.

Peter (Carl). Zeittafeln zur griechischen Geschichte. 6, verb. Aufl. gr. 4, iv, 666 S. Halle, *Buchh. d. Waisenhauses*. m. 4.50.

Petzold (W.) Die Bedeutung d. Griechischen f. das Verständniss der Pflanzennamen. 4, 38 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.20.

Pfizmaier (A.) Chinesische Begründungen der Taolehre. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 69 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 1.

Pfordten (Herm. Frhr. v. der). Zur Geschichte der griechischen Denominative. gr. 8, iii, 158 S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 4.

Plautus (T. Maccius). Ausgewählte Komödien, erklärt v. Aug. O. Fr. Lorenz. 3 Bdchn. Miles gloriosus. 2 umgearb. Aufl. gr. 8, vii, 294 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 2.70.

Porphyrii philosophi Platonici opuscula selecta, iterum recognovit Aug. Nauck. 8, xxiv, 320 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 3.

Pruzsinsky (Joa. de). De Propertii carminibus in libros distribuendis. Diss. gr. 8, 37 S. Budapest, *Kilidn*. m. 1.

Rannow (Max). Studia Theocritea. Diss. gr. 8, 53 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 1.20.

Rauschen (Gerh.) Ephemerides Tullianae rerum inde ab exsilio Ciceronis [Mart. LVIII a. Chr.] usque ad extremum annum LIV gestarum. Diss. gr. 8, 64 S. Bonn, *Behrendt*. m. 1.20.

Riehmann (Jos.) De litis instrumentis quae exstant in Demosthenis quae fertur oratione adversus Neaeram. gr. 8, 51 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.

Ritter (H.) et Preller (L.) Historia philosophiae graecae. Testimonia auctorum conlegerunt notisque instruxerunt H. R. et L. P. Pars I septimum edita. Physicorum doctrinae recognitae a Fr. Schultess. gr. 8, vii, 180 S. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes*. m. 3.60.

Rosenstock (Paul). De Donato, Terentii, et Servio, Vergillii explicatore, syntaxeos latinae interpretibus. Diss. gr. 8, 85 S. Marggrabovae. Königsberg, *Koch & Reimer*. m. 1.50.

Sabbāg's (Mihā'il). Grammatik der arabischen Umgangssprache in Syrien u. Aegypten. Nach der Münchener Handschrift, hrsg. v. H. Thorbecke. gr. 8, x, 80 S. Strassburg, *Trübner*. m. 4.

Sallustii Crispi (C.) *Bellum Catilinae u. bellum Iugurthinum*. Schulausg. v. Ign. Prammer. gr. 8, xl, 110 S. Wien, *Hölder*. m. 1.20.

Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften. Hrsg. v. Herm. Collitz. 4 Bd., 1 Hft. Wortregister zum 1 Bde. v. Rich. Meister. gr. 8, iv, 106 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* m. 5. (I, II, 1 u. IV, 1, m. 22.60.)

Sauppe (Herm.) *Commentatio de phratriis atticis*. gr. 4, 13 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. —80.

Schaefer (Arnold). *Demosthenes u. seine Zeit*. 2, rev. Ausg. 2 Bd., gr. 8, vii, 566 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. à m. 10.

Schepss (Geo.) *Priscillian, e. neuaufgefundenener lat. Schriftsteller d. 4 Jahrh.* Mit 1 Bl. in Orig.-Grösse, Fksm.-Druck d. Manuskriptes. gr. 8, 26 S. Würzburg, *Stuber's Verl.* m. 1.50.

Schmidt (F. W.) *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern, nebst e. Anh. zur Kritik der Anthologie*. 1 Bd.; Zu Aeschylos u. Sophokles. gr. 8, xiv, 282 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 8.

Schmidt (J. H. Heinr.) *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache*. 4 Bd., gr. 8, xiv, 875 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 16. (cpl. m. 54.)

Schneider (Rud.) *Ilerda*. Mit 1 Karte v. H. Kiepert. gr. 8, viii, 43 S., m. 1 Ansicht. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 1.60.

Schrader (O.) *Linguistisch-historische Forschungen zur Handelsgeschichte u. Waarenkunde*. 1 Tl., ar. 8, xii, 291 S. Jena, *Costenoble*. m. 8.

Schumacher (Carl). *De republica Rhodiorum commentatio*. Diss. gr. 8, 64 S. Heidelberg, *C. Winter*. m. 1.80.

Schweder (E.) *Beiträge zur Kritik der Chorographie d. Augustus*. 3 Thl., gr. 8, 59 S. Kiel, *Haeseler*, 1883. m. 2. (cpl. m. 6.)

Schwerdt (F. J.) *Methodologische Beiträge zur Wiederherstellung der griechischen Tragiker*. gr. 8, iii, 208 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 5.20.

Seffer (G. H.) *Elementarbuch der hebräischen Sprache*. 8 Aufl., besorgt v. F. Sebal. gr. 8, xiv, 378 S. Leipzig, *Brandstetter*. m. 4.50.

Seidel (Eug.) *De usu praepositionum Plotiniano quaestiones*. Diss. gr. 8, 77 S. Nissae. Breslau, *Köhler*. m. 1.

Smend (Rud.) u. Socin (Alb.) *Die Inschrift d. Königs Mesa v. Moab, f. akadem. Vorlesgn. hrsg.* gr. 8, iii, 35 S. m. 1 Steintaf. [in Mappe]. Freiburg i. Br., *Mohr in Comm.* m. 2.50.

*Sophokles' Werke*. Deutsch in der Versweise der Urschrift u. erklärt v. Adf. Schöll. 15 u. 16 Lfg. Rev. v. Prof. Fritz Schöll. 8. Berlin, *Langenscheidt*. à m. —35.

— *König Oedipus, übers. in den Versmassen d. Originals v. Thdr. Meckbach*. 4, 30 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.

Speidel (P.) *Elementarstilistik der lateinischen Sprache in Syntaxis ornata*. 2 Bdchn 2, verb. Aufl. 8, viii, 180 S. Heilbronn, *Scheurlen's Verl.* m. 2.

*Studien, Leipziger, zur classischen Philologie*, hrsg. v. O. Ribbeck, H. Lipsius, C. Wachsmuth, E. Rohde. 9 Bd., 1 Hft., gr. 8, 170 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. m. 4.

Taciti (P. Cornelii). *Opera, rec. atque interpretatus est J. C. Orellius*. Vol. II. *Germania. Dialogus de claris oratoribus. Agricola. Historiae*. Ed. II curaverunt H. Schweizer-Sidler, G. Andresen, C. Meiser. Fasc. 5. *Historiarum liber II*, ed. Carolus Meiser. gr. 8, S. 309-390. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 4.50.

Taciti (Cornelii). Ab excessu divi Augusti libri. Quartum recognovit Carolus Halm. Fasc. I et II, Lib. I-XVI. 8, 373 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1884. m. —75.

Toepffer (Joa.) Quaestiones Pisistrateae. Diss. Lex.-8, 148 S. Dorpat, *Karow*. m. 250.

Ulpiani (Domitii). Quae vulgo vocantur fragmenta. [Aus "Iurisprudentiae anteiustinianae reliquiae."] 8, 83 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. —75.

Vergili Maronis (P.) Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis. Recognovit Otto Güthling. 2 tomi. 8. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 135. Inhalt: 1. Bucolica, Georgica. xxi, 89 S. m. —45.—2. Aeneis. xxxvi, 274 S. m. —90.

Verhandlungen der 38 Versammlung deutscher Philologen u. Schulmänner in Giessen vom 30 Septbr. bis 3 Oktbr. 1885. gr. 4, viii, 322 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 12.

Wagner (Jos.) Junggrammatisches f. die Schule. Lex.-8, 16 S. Brünn, Wien, *Hölder*. m. —60.

Wahrmund (Adf.) Die Geschichtschreibung der Griechen. 3 Aufl., 8, iv 126 S. Berlin, *Langenscheidt*. m. 150.

Weise (C. H.) Lexicon Plautinum. Ed. II. locupletata. gr. 8, vi, 164 S. Quedlinburg, *Basse*. m. 4.

Wellmann (Max.) De Istro Callimachio. Diss. gr. 8, 124 S. Gryphiswaldiae. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 2.

Wendland (Paul.) Quaestiones Musonianae. gr. 8, v, 66 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 180.

Xenophon's Werke. 15 Lfg., 8. Berlin, *Langenscheidt*. à m. —35. Inhalt: Anabasis od. Feldzug d. jüngeren Cyrus. Übers. u. durch Anmerkgn. erläutert v. Dr. A. Forbiger. 5 Lfg., 4 Aufl., S. 49-96.

Zeitschrift f. ägyptische Sprache u. Alterthumskunde. Gegründet 1863 v. H. Brugsch. Hrsg. u. weitergeführt 1864-1884 v. K. R. Lepsius. Fortgesetzt v. H. Brugsch u. L. Stern. 24 Jahrg. 1886. 4 Hfte., hoch 4, 1 u. 2 Hft., 74 S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 15.

Zernecke (Alfr.) De choro Sophocleo et Aeschyleo quaestionum capita tria. Diss. gr. 8, 29 S. Posnaniae, 1885. Breslau, *Köhler*. m. 1.

Zimmermann (Emil.) De epistulari temporum usu Ciceroniano quaestiones grammaticae. I, 4, 25 S. Rastenburgae. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. —80.

Zimmermann (Rich.) De nothorum Athenis condicione. Diss. gr. 8, 53 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 120.

Zvetaieff (Johs.) Inscriptiones Italiae inferioris dialecticae, in usum praecipue academicum composuit J. Z. Lex.-8, viii, 186 S. m. 3 Taf. Mosquae. Leipzig, *Brockhaus' Sort. in Comm* m. 8.

## ITALIAN.

Dal Ponte (P.) Pensarci su. Criterii manzoniani di lingua, di letteratura e di critica. Cividale. In-16, 206 pp. L. 250.

De Nino (A.) Vecchi errori grammaticali e filologici. Casalbordino. In-16. 199 pp. L. 2.

D'Ovidio (Fr.) e Sailer (L.) Discussioni manzoniane. Città di Castello. In-16. 219 pp. L. 3.

Gelmetti (L.) Riforma ortografica, con tre nuovi segni alfabetici per la buona pronunzia italiana. Milano. In-16, xlv, 218 pp., e 1 tav. L. 3.

Lolli (E.) Corso di grammatica ebraica. Padova. In-8, vii, 415 pp. L. 5.

Miscellanea di filologia e linguistica, in memoria di Napoleone Caix e Ugo Angelo Canello. Firenze. In-4, 516 pp. L. 20.

Platone. Il Critone, dichiarato da Eugenio Ferrai. Torino. In-8, xviii, 37 pp. (Biblioteca di Classici greci e latini con note ital.) L. 1.

Ruggiero (E. de). Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane. Fasc. I. Roma. In-8, 32 pp. L. 1.50.

Sabbadini (R.) Guarino Veronese e gli archetipi di Celso e Plauto, con una appendice sull' Aurispa. Livorno. In-16, 72 pp. L. 1.50.

Sailer (U.) Stazio e la sua Tebaide: studio critico, con un saggio di versione. Venezia. In-16, 142 pp. L. 2.

Stoppato (L.) Fonologia italiana. Milano. In-16, 101 pp. (Man. Hoepli). L. 1.50.



## BOOKS RECEIVED.

- Acta S. Marinae et S. Christophori. Edidit Hermannus Usener. Bonn, 1886.
- Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum. Edita a Societate Philologicorum Bohemicorum. Fasciculus III. Sophoclis Tragoediae. Scholarum in usum. Ed. Iosephus Kral. Prague, *Böhmische Philol. Gesell.*, 1886. 15 kr.
- Braga (Theophilo). Cursa da Historia da litteratura Portugueza. Lisboa, *Nova Livraria Nacional*, 1886.
- Bredsdorff (J. H.) Om Aarsagerne til Sprogenes Forandrigen. Kjobenhavn, *Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag*, 1886.
- Brugmann (Karl). Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Erster Band. Einleitung u. Lautlehre. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1886.
- Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. The First Epistle to the Corinthians, with Notes, Map, Introduction and Appendices, by Rev. J. J. Lias. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* 75 cts.
- Christian Gaul. From the French of Alfred Rambaud's Histoire de la Civilisation Française. By Edward Spencer Dodgson. Jersey, 1886.
- Classical Atlas. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1886.
- Harris (J. Rendel). Fragments of Philo Judaeus. Newly edited, with two facsimiles. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1886.
- Holthausen (Ferdinand). Die Soester Mundart. Laut- u. Formenlehre nebst Texten. Norden u. Leipzig, *Diedr. Soltan*, 1886. 3 m. (Forschungen herausg. von Verein für Niederdeutsche Sprachforschung.)
- Internationale Zeitschrift für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft. Begründet u. herausg. von F. Techmer. II Band, 2 Hälfte. Leipzig, *J. A. Barth*, 1886.
- Knortz (Karl). Gustav Seyffarth. Eine biographische Skizze. New York, *E. Steiger & Co.*, 1886.
- Français (le) Parlé. Morceaux choisis à l'usage des étrangers avec la prononciation figurée. Par Paul Passy. Heilbronn, *Henninger Frères*, 1886.
- Gilman (Arthur). Short Stories from the Dictionary. Chicago, *The Interstate Publishing Co.*, 1886. 60 cts.
- Glossarum Hibernicarum Supplementum conguessit Heinricus Zimmer. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1886.
- Gomperz (Theodor). Über den Abschluss des herodoteischen Geschichtswerken. Wien, *Carl Gerold's Sohn*, 1886.
- Hall (G. S.) and Mansfield (John M.) Bibliography of Education. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1886.
- Körting (Gustav). Encyclopaedie u. Methodologie der Romanischen Philologie. Dritter Theil. Die Encyclopaedie der Romanischen Einzel-Philologien. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1886. m. 10.
- Livi (Titi) Historiarum Romanarum Libri qui supersunt ex rec. I. N. Madvig. Quartum edd. Madvigius et Ussing. Vol. II, Pars I. Hauniae, *Sumptibus Librariae Gyldendalanae*, MDCCCLXXXVI.
- Macmillan's Shorter Latin Course. By A. M. Cook. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushings & Bailey*, 1886. 40 cts.

Phrases de tous les jours. Par Félix Franke. Heilbronn, *Henninger Frères*, 1886.

Schmidt (F. W.) Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern. Band I. Zu Aeschylos und Sophokles. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*. m. 8.

Schmidt (Dr. J. H. Heinrich). Synonymik der griechischen Sprache. 4ter Band. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1886.

Schrader, O. Linguistische historische Forschungen zur Handelsgeschichte u. Waarenkunde. Erster Theil. Jena, *Hermann Costenoble*, 1886. m. 8.

Seyffarth (Gustavus), The Literary Life of. An Autobiographical Sketch. New York, *E. Steiger*.

Soltau (Wilhelm). Prolegomena zu einer römischen Chronologie. Berlin, *R. Gaertner's Verlagsbuchhandlung* (Hermann Heyfelder), 1886.

ΕΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ. Carmin partim sua Graeca et Latina, partim aliena in alterutramque linguam ab se conversa elegit recensuit in ordinem redegit Theodorus Korsch. Hauniae, *Sumptibus Librariae Gyldehdalianae*, MDCCCLXXXVI.

Stickney's First Reader. (Classics for Children.) Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1886.

Thirty-Second Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of New York. Albany, 1886.

Tyler (Harry W.) Entertainments in Chemistry. Boston and Chicago, *The Interstate Publishing Co.*, 1886. 60 cts.

Tyler (W. S.) The Iliad of Homer. Books XVI-XXIV, with Explanatory Notes for the Use of Students in Colleges. New York, *Harper & Brothers*, 1886.

Videira (J. Carvilho). A Questiao Social. As Bodas Reaes e o Congresso Republicanao. Lisboa, 1886.

Weil (H.) L'Auteur du premier discours contre Aristogiton est-il bien informé des institutions d'Athènes? Mélanges Renier. Tirage à part. Paris, *Vieweg*, 1886.

Wells, Treat and Sargent. Through a Microscope. Boston and Chicago, *The Interstate Publishing Co.*, 1886. 60 cts.

Wightman (Sarah W.) The Making of Pictures. Boston and Chicago, *The Interstate Publishing Co.*, 1886. 60 cts.

Williams (George Huntington). Modern Petrography. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1886.

Zeitschrift für Assyriologie u. verwandte Gebiete. Herausg. v. Carl Bezold. I Band, 2 u. 3 Heft. Leipzig, *Otto Schulz*, 1886.

### CORRECTION.

In my article on the Consecutive Sentence in Greek, in the last number of this Journal, pp. 169, 170, for "Mr. Ridgeway" read "Mr. Whitelaw." My excuse must be the naïve excuse recently given by the Spectator for a similar blunder—that the writer was thinking more of the subject than of the author of the essay cited; to which may be added the extenuating fact that the passage was hastily incorporated while the article was going through the press, and that Mr. Ridgeway's name was at that moment uppermost in my mind.

B. L. G.